BHARATA SHAKTI

BHARATA SHAKTI

COLLECTION OF ADDRESSES ON INDIAN CULTURE

BY

SIR JOHN WOODROFFE

Third and Enlarged Edition

PUBLISHERS:

GANESH & CO., MADRAS

1st	Edition	September	1917
2nd	„	„	1918
3rd	„	July	1921

THE CAMBRIDGE PRESS, MADRAS

CONTENTS

BY THE SAME AUTHOR

SHAKTI AND SHAKTA

Essays and addresses on the Tantra Shastra ... Rs. 7 8 0

THE SERPENT POWER

(Kundalini Yoga) ... Rs. 15 12 0

GARLAND OF LETTERS

Reprinting.

IS INDIA CIVILIZED? ... Rs. 2 8 0

SEED OF RACE ... Re. 1 0 0

PREFACE

Being desirous of publishing in collected form the speeches of Sir John Woodroffe, here reproduced, I asked his permission to do so and in reply received from him the following letter:—

"You ask my permission to print these speeches of mine saying that you think they may be of use. You have my consent. I shall be glad, if it be the fact, that any words of mine help, in however small a degree, to stem those movements which work for the *cultural conquest* of this country, and which having unfortunately done much in past years are likely under certain circumstances and in the absence of right resistance, to acquire greater vigour after the war. This cultural question is of equal importance with the purely political one, now receiving so much public attention. I cannot discuss this last, but it is open to me to say that if Indian political efforts can rightly secure Home Rule, it is only a successful cultural defence, which will provide a Home to rule.

India is not a mere geographical expression nor a mere congeries of people, who happen to be on this particular part of the Earth's surface, but who might as well have been elsewhere. India is an Idea. It is a particular Shakti, the Bharata Shakti, distinguished from all others by Her own peculiar nature and qualities. No home is a truly Indian Home, which is not Her expression. The basis of all culture and the maker of all nationality is Religion. This is the root and trunk of the great Tree of Life with many branches, amongst which the chief are those of Philosophy and Art, of Knowledge and Beauty. May the great and wonderful antique life of India be re-born in the forms of to-day."

Heartily agreeing in general with Sir John in what he says, I share his hopes and wishes for my country and republish his words, believing that they will serve it.

Calcutta,

NOLINI CHATERJEE.

1st September 1917.

PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION

It is pleasing to note that the first edition was well received by the public. In this reprint I have added a few more addresses which are of as equal value and weight as those in the first edition. On reading *Bharata Shakti* a Western friend writes: "It would have been so much wisdom lost to the world if they had not been brought to light. I have read the addresses several times. They appeal to me by their sincerity and forthrightness, and they have shown me that the great religion of India interprets for us Westerns a great deal that is obscure in our Christianity. I am sure that a course of Eastern teaching would clear up difficulties. These addresses, coming as they do at a time of mental and political unrest, must be of immense value to all who heard or who read them."

I hope the intellectual public will accord to this enlarged edition the same reception as it has done to its predecessor.

Calcutta,

NOLINI CHATERJEE.

September 10, 1918.

PREFACE TO THE THIRD EDITION

To this Edition have been added the letter "Seed of Race" and the Postscript.

Calcutta,

1st July 1921.

NOLINI CHATERJEE.

POSTSCRIPT

Since this book was first published, and the speeches and papers which it reproduces were given and read, important transformations of public opinion and movements have taken place. From the position here taken up, some are to be recorded with satisfaction. I mean that I welcome the increasing strength of the effort for the preservation of the Indian type and culture, and of the reaction against any such excessive western influence as threatens to overwhelm both. We must also welcome the attention now being given to the question of food which is the basis of all others. Since the first All India Cow Conference (the Presidential speech of which is here printed) was held, the Gorakshana movement has made a little way. The obstruction, in this as in other matters, is the inertia and

apathy of the mass, often sadly enough too poorly nourished to be capable of feeling or doing anything; whilst some of the well to do who might, if they stirred themselves, do something in this connection for their country, hesitate to associate themselves, with the cow as with other of their country's "superstitions." Besides some are beef-eaters themselves. Many English are finding that beef is too heating a diet in a hot country, but their followers here have yet to learn of it. Some again are indifferent. Yet others are timid for fear of latent "fanaticisms." We must get on all the same with the good work. The Cow stands for Prithivî. Her state is a reflection of that of India. If life and power be sought it can only be had first through food. Food (Anna) is a form of Shakti. As the Maitreyi Upanishad says, Prâna is Annamaya: and as the Mahânârayana Upanishad says, "By food Prâna and by Prâna strength." The ultimate basis of all Indian distress to-day is want of food, want of means to live.

Lord Tenterden in the House of Lords recently moved the question of the state of cattle and their slaughter. He was opposed by a noble Lord who, I am told, displayed his knowledge of this country as follows:—"110 millions of people in India eat beef when they can get it. It is the food of the very poor." He added that any instructions on the killing of cattle "would give rise to the very greatest resentment among a large number of very poor people." Apparently there was no one to tell him how grotesquely absurd these and other statements were. But, as every Indian knows, it is not only as regards the cow that ignorance prevails.

To pass to things of the mind, the idea of what (whether it be an apt term or not) is called National Education is taking stronger hold. An Anglican Bishop was reported in the newspapers as having asked what this term meant. It may be shortly replied that one of its characteristics is that it is education the nature of which is determined by the Indian *people* themselves and not by others,

or which is determined by representatives which they and not others have selected to decide and act in their stead. If these conditions are fulfilled, it does not for the present, or indeed the future, matter what we call it; since it is probable that the education which the bulk of the people select will be not merely the education which they want but which they ought to want. It is a noble purpose to unite East and West in all friendships. But it seems to me that a preliminary to such a union is a free and truly Indian Self on the one side, as there will certainly be a free and truly western Self on the other. The forces of the future are likely to be super-national, but this does not meanwhile involve any cultural Eurasianism.

As regards the vernacular, I would refer to my letter at the conclusion of the book in which I reply to certain criticisms passed on my "Seed of Race." I agree with some views expressed in the same paper.

The English language (it is there said) is an introduction to Western culture at present

for the few, for men in commerce, scientific and other professional men, and so on. This is its legitimate use as a secondary language for those who can afford one. But English has not kept its proper place, and has in cases dethroned the mother tongue. People (it has been pointed out) have been told that they cannot attain true self-development without the knowledge of English. If this were true then *self*-development is not possible. No doubt if the Indian people are inferior and incapable the sooner they mould themselves in all things upon the model of their capable superiors and civilisers the better. But this is not my view, according to which western culture should be so imparted as not to lose the best in the Indian character and tradition. Language is thought. Thought is life and character. Variety of language is variety of life, as the Hebrew writer Zangwill well says after contrasting the ancient Hebrew salutation "Peace be to you" with the modern greeting "How's business?" The English language may be made gradually available for a wider

class. This should be done with care and caution so as to prevent loss of good racial characteristics. Those who are first well educated in that which is their own will receive good from initiation in the culture of others. Otherwise this latter will have ill effect. The majority cannot receive both a full vernacular and English education. Those who cannot receive the first should not be given the second. At present the Indian woman and peasant are the vehicles of Indian tradition. This does not mean that we should exclude the Indian woman from a knowledge of English or any other knowledge. On the contrary, those who are apt to receive, and who reach out for it, should be given the fullest knowledge of the world about them, and so become true mothers to their children. It is another thing to upset in a sudden and wholesale way either women's or men's minds. But education in one's own must precede education in that which belongs to others. Such qualifications are needed because one is apt to be misunderstood. One of the results of a

hybrid education and civilisation is that the simplest and truest things are misunderstood: because in order to understand, one must be *alive*, be a self and look to it first and not to others. It will be said that false ideas are passing. To some extent that is so. But the old have not altogether gone and other false notions are taking their place. As regard the first point I am told that in an Indian University even Sanskrit is taught in English which means that only those who know the latter tongue can learn the classic language of even their own country. To me this seems an absurdity, but I suppose it is not to those who have been taught that they cannot do anything, even as regards their own language, without the aid of English. In the same institution a European Sanskrit grammar is prescribed, the production of which was paid for at a larger price than would be offered to any Indian. Who offered it ? Not the English. The Indian cannot I suppose write a grammar. Yet India has Pânini, Patanjali's Mahâbhâshya, Supadma, Kalâpa, the Vâkyapadîya, Bho-

padeva, Sangkshiptasara, Siddântakaumudi, Laghukaumudi, amongst the ancient, whilst the Vyakarana Kaumudi, Upakramanika of Ishvara Chandra Vidyasâgara, and the Âshubodha of Târanatha Vâchaspati head the moderns. How is it that all these have been displaced? A distinguished European Sanskritist once asked me where I had learned Sanskrit, whether in India or in Europe. My reply was that I had not learnt Sanskrit, but that I had been and was still learning Sanskrit in this country. "Oh what a pity," he said. "Why" I asked? "They cannot teach Sanskrit in this country: they have no system," he replied. I laughed. "They cannot teach Sanskrit in this country,"—the country of Pânini the founder of the science of language, the greatest grammarian the world has known, and of innumerable pandits, men of real learning, few though men of the highest attainment now be. How has Sanskrit learning come down to us today if no one has been able to teach it?

We may then record with satisfaction a

reaction against all lack of life and degeneracy, and that awakening sense in the mass (fully awake in some) of self-confidence and self-worth. Why "satisfaction" it may be asked? If the Indian wants to lose himself in a western Nirvâna, why should he not do so? My answer is that whilst, as is natural to one of my birth, I wish the West at its best to survive (for the white race which, through its merits and notwithstanding its defects, rules nearly the whole world, is a great and vital race evoking from its true inner being many a fine ideal) I cannot yet believe that it is good for any man or people to lose their own natural characteristics. I believe moreover that the East and particularly India possesses that which is of the highest value. I wish to see this preserved for the mutual benefit of East and West. But any reaction against western influence must be intelligent, otherwise it will not survive. It is sheer silliness to reject anything merely because it is foreign. It must be unsuitable, or there must be some other good reason for doing so. Any reaction, to

endure, must be based on knowledge and reason. It must be known in what consists western and eastern civilizations, what in them has worth, and what is worthless. It is not recognised that there is a collective as well as individual excretion. The whole Earth itself has its Apânavâyu and Prâna-vâyu. So with races and social units. If they be vital, they regularly appropriate and eject. But to do either rightly, they must be living individual *selves*. I hope to deal in another place with the question of what is good and bad in western civilization, which is to-day as wholly and wrongly condemned by some, as aforetimes it was indiscriminately appreciated. There is nothing wholly good or bad in the world. Discrimination is the mark of justice and sense. If a man is a "progressivist," he should be so with sense. Then between such an one and a "retrograde eclairé," as the French would say, the difference is only one of temperament.

Any mentality and outlook which is destitute of independence and vitality is repugnant—evoking that feeling of disgust

which every truly *living* being feels for every form of servience and parasitism. Life is our Devatā, and we serve it in the form of ourselves. We all have our merits and our faults and can learn of one another, but we must still, during that operation, remain ourselves and believe in our own worth. Each centre can, and should be, independent of others without illwill to them. We serve them best by being ourselves. It is pleasant therefore to record that this self-worth is being daily more and more recognised. In other countries it is a feeling to be curbed. Here it has been the other way about, partly because of what the late Henry James called "a superstitious valuation of European civilization." This saying well summarises the position for those who have understanding. Due value must be allowed to western, or any other civilization, recognising that however valuable it may be, the civilization of one people is not in all respects suitable for another. On the other hand the valuation must not be superstitious,—a credit given merely because it is western. Indian civilization

too has value, and we can avoid over-belief here also, ever following the high path of reason. On this point I may cite a passage from a recent book of Professor J. S. Mackenzie, formerly Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, and later Professor of Logic and Philosophy in University College, Cardiff. He writes ("Elements of Constructive Philosophy" p. 475), after referring to the "great oriental religions which have had a firmer hold and a more far-reaching influence than any others on masses of mankind, and by which the civilization of the western world has also been very largely affected," the following:—
"*The Religion that is most nearly akin to a philosophical reconstruction would seem to be that of Brahmanism.* It is not altogether creditable to us, as the nation to which the protection of Indian civilization has fallen, that we have done so little towards the interpretation and appreciation of this great religious movement. Here, as in so many other directions, the Germans have accomplished very much more, and have succeeded in absorbing a

great deal of what is most valuable in Eastern thought, giving it at the same time a form that appeals more readily to the European mind. Schopenhauer in particular has adopted in his philosophy many of the leading conceptions of Brahmanism. He has however interpreted it in its most pessimistic sense. It is possible to appreciate Indian speculation without committing ourselves to the pessimism to which it tends. Recent theories of the Absolute in our own country—such as those set forth by Green, Caird, Bradley, Bosanquet McTaggart and others—have brought us nearer to some of the oriental conceptions, but have on the whole interpreted them in an optimistic sense. The last named writer in particular has familiarised us with the characteristic oriental conception of successive incarnations, and of the illusory character of existence in space and time, but without the conception of absorption in the Infinite One by which these ideas have generally been accompanied in Eastern thought. The constructive attempt which has been made

in the present book has a somewhat similar tendency."

India (I may add) possesses a wonderful solvent—a solvent of irreligion and materialism on the one hand, and of false religion superstition and intolerance on the other.

Hinduism has no word for "pessimism," a European conception, nor for optimism either. The universe according to it is a Dvandva or duality of good and evil. We are thus rescued from some "progressive" futilities. The phrase "illusory existence" leads to misconception. Much in Schopenhauer does not represent Vedantic thought. But my object here is not to criticise or affirm the rightness of this or that doctrine, but to record a recent appreciation of the value of oriental theories for the benefit of those doubters whose doubts are always reserved for what is their own. A sick person is cheered if we find him looking well. A man who doubts his powers will gain confidence if we tell him that we believe in them. The faint hearted are strengthened by encouragement. And in fact there is still much in the state of India and its people to discou-

rage those who are working for Indian good, though there are to-day also signs which bring hope. The encouragement of others is only needed in so far and to the extent that we are ourselves weak. I suppose all have their moments of depression. Hinduism profoundly gives the characteristics of the Pashu or Animal, whether beast or man, as eating, drinking, self-propagation and *fear*. It is the mark of the animal to fear. We are all in varying degrees animals, and have in such degree fear. He who rises above the animal state, to that knowledge which no beast has nor can attain, becomes fearless. So it is said, "He who sees duality, he fears." What is the remedy? To ask, as so many do, for the remedy is clearly a sign of lack of life and the presence of disease. Nature inspires the strong and healthful who solve their own problems in various ways. And there is a reason for this, for these are in contact with the Whole, which is Health, and thus can tap the mighty forces of the Personal Will.

Before pursuing this subject, there are

two practical matters referred to in this book upon which a word is called for.

As regards Law, I, who am myself a lawyer, with an experience of over thirty years of the Indian courts, have frequently urged (as in my note to the University Commission here published) that there is an excess of litigation and lawyers in this country. "Uncivilised" countries have fortunately been spared both. I say "fortunately" for, at the best, both are to a large extent necessary evils. What may happen in an "uncivilised" or "savage" society is pictured by Herman Melville in his "Typee" (Ch. 28) where, speaking of the Marquesas Islands in the first half of the nineteenth century, he says that there was no general rule of conduct except "taboo." There were no courts or police. No one was put on trial for any offence. In the darkest nights the inhabitants slept securely. There was no theft or assassination. Things of value were left in the open. Title deeds there were none, the broad valleys being held in free simple from Nature herself. Their hosti-

lity to Europeans was (he said) due to the wrongs inflicted on them by the latter. Of their feuds with neighbouring tribes he could not speak. Referring to their cannibalism in the case of slain enemies he asserted that those who indulged in it were otherwise humane and virtuous. In short, he says, there were no legal possessions whatever, and yet everything went on in harmony. "How" (he asks) "are we to explain this enigma. These islanders were heathens, savages, cannibals. And how came they, without the aid of established law, to exhibit in so eminent a degree that social order, which is the greatest blessing and highest pride of the social state?" And he answers his question by saying it was *an inherent principle of honesty and charity towards each other.* The better principles of human nature existed without need for enforcement by the statute book. He declared that after passing a few weeks in this valley of the Marquesas he formed a higher estimate of human nature than he had ever before entertained. He adds however "But alas!

since then I have been one of the crew of a man of war, and the pent up wickedness of five hundred men has nearly overturned all my previous theories." Some form of evil exists and has existed everywhere; for where is man perfect? But some of the grossest wrongs are to be found in what are called advanced civilizations. We no longer in fact eat our slain enemy, but we war, kill, lie and steal, and so need police and courts to uphold our civilization. There is no question of the need, given the actual facts. But we can strive to reduce the evil which law exists to repress. Even food, necessary as it is, becomes injurious if there be too much of it or of the wrong kind.

All this does not mean that we must become again the simple and humane cannibals of our author. I say this because, to be understood, one must sometimes have the five mouths of Shiva. The quotation I have made does, however, imply that we must all strive to attain the "principle of honesty and charity towards each other," and thus curb the excessive and evil

fecundity of law, lawyers and litigation. Let us shortly then survey the present situation.

A large body of English law and legal ideas have been imported into this country. Some personal laws of the Hindus and Mahommedans have been retained, but English courts have operated to stop its natural growth. What is preserved has been interpreted largely, and in ultimate resort wholly, by judges to whom it is a foreign system, the foundations of which are not understood. Indian law cannot be separated from the general Indian culture of which it is a part. The English case-law system, with its judicial precedents has, been introduced and preserved, even after the non-English and continental code system has been adopted. One or other system should be abolished, preferably the case-law system. The enormous multiplication of precedents is an evil largely increased by the growing number of reported cases in legal journals which must, if they are to be profitable to their proprietors, be filled with grist from the legal mill whatever

be its quality. The confusion caused by conflicting cases is great, and increases the length and risks of litigation. Time is wasted over the exact wording of judgments as if they were Shruti. Procedure is over complicated, and rather impedes than aids justice. In short the legal system lacks the character and simplicity appropriate to this country.

Turn then from the system to its working and workers.

Hitherto opportunities of livelihood for what are called "educated" Indians has been restricted, in part owing to their choice, that is, refusal to avail themselves of their opportunities, and in part to circumstances beyond their control. The result is that more than are wanted try to gain a livelihood at the law. The manufacture of B. L.'s is on a wholesale scale.

The result of course is that there are more lawyers than work for them. A further result is, in the worst cases, fomenting of litigation, and in others neglect to discourage (as the best English practitioners do) resort to courts. It is well known

that there are many forms of ill-doing—false cases, concoction of evidence, perjury, offences under the legal practitioners act, and morally degrading conduct of every kind. Any one familiar with courts of law knows of these and other forms of corruption there. The law is not infrequently used to further the ends of hatred and revenge. The greater the litigation the greater the amount of evil. Probably there is no worse atmosphere, both physical and moral, in this country than exists in the law courts, even though it is of course the fact that there are also some good and honest people to be found there. The credit of the courts has not been enhanced by dispensing persons of some social importance from attending at them—a privilege much sought, like that of possessing guns and the right to deck retainers with unnecessary swords. The people are becoming poorer by litigation. The hard won money of the cultivator and others finds its way into lawyers' pockets. It is better that the poor should have enough to eat and marry their

daughters than that lawers should raise their "standard of living" through superfluous wealth.

To pass to a minor evil there is the legalistic mind which prefers to discuss law rather than facts, which splits hairs, looks at technicalities rather than realities, and is paralysed even when in view of the desired end by some supposed technical obstacle or other.

Der eine hatte ein Haar gespalten.

Der zweite ein vortrag daruber gehalten.

Im Buche des Dritten stand aber zu lesen.

Das Haar war nicht's richtige Haar gewesen. (A man split a hair. A second gave a lecture on it. But in the book of a third you could read that the hair which was split was not *that* hair.)

For many years I have watched the dissection of *that* hair, and indeed in the earlier years myself took some part in the operation. *Confiteor.* But in later times I have often thought how much the country would have gained if the able dissectors of *that* hair had given their talents to

other and more profitable service of their country. The evil of which I speak is increased in India by the fact that many of its people are of subtle mind and fond of disputation, and clients in general are not averse to litigation. The ordinary Englishman on the other hand (as many of the best and wiser people here) endeavours to keep out of the courts which he may formally venerate at a distance, notwithstanding some caustic criticism of the law and its ways. Up to now (for times are changing) one of the finest qualities of the English race has been its criticism of itself and its institutions. They, like all strong people, have been able to afford themselves this luxury.

An instance of the legalistic malady to which I refer was brought to my notice some years ago. An Indian club was long in arrear with its rent, and the landlord gave notice of proceedings for eviction in 48 hours. The members hurriedly assembled. All were of course naturally interested in not being cast into the street. But up got a legal member and objected to the meeting

being held on the ground that no sufficient notice had been given under some sacred rule or other of the club. This was too much for an engineer present, whose mind had not been divorced from reality by legal technicalities, and who pointed out that the rules were made for themselves and not themselves for the rules, and that the material question was not notice or no notice, but whether the club was to lose its premises before the time mentioned by the rule had run out. I could supply many other instances of this sort of thing.

Of course all know that there have been lawyers with great minds. But these persons were great not because they were lawyers but because they were great. They would have succeeded not unlikely in anything they did. With some exceptions, like the "Black-letter," men the greatness of their minds protected them from legalistic narrowness and futility. The chief harm is done in the case of minds of ordinary calibre which lose their natural simplicity and directness of outlook.

As some law is necessary (and it would

seem a great deal) to regulate and keep in check bodies of civilised men, lawyers are, under present conditions, to some extent necessary both to frame our laws, and to fight the quarrels which seem increasingly incidental to civilised life. But a point is reached, and is certainly reached in this country, in which an excess of legalism, like all other excess, is an evil. If as much energy were spent on sanitation and general betterment as is expended on law, the country would not only be free of much of its present suffering, but many of its people would be less poverty-stricken. Many too would become morally better. No one will dare say that litigation is in itself a good thing. At most it is a necessary evil, nor can it be said that the amicable settlement of disputes out of court is not better than contentious fighting. Many bodies of sensible men, such as the Chambers of Commerce, insist on arbitration clauses in their contracts. I am of course aware that this question has today in some quarters taken a political colour. But I am not looking at this question, or

any other here discussed, from a political aspect. I consider it is a part of Chitta-shuddhi and economic betterment, on both of which matters all may discuss and all should agree.

This subject of the legal profession leads me to say a word on Ayurvedic medicine. In Bengal, and not improbably elsewhere, it is fashionable to have charitable dispensaries. The country abounds in valuable herbal and other remedies. So much is this so that the celebrated Kaviraj Gangadhar Sen of Murshidabad, when called to attend a case outside his district, used only to take with him such medicines as could not be prepared rapidly. For the rest he relied on the plants and other materials he would gather near the home of his patient. Ayurvedic remedies are effective, as I personally know in respect to those which I have tried. They do no harm as some allopathic drugs do, for nothing is a medicine in Ayurveda which can, in any case, be harmful. Like all Indian things they are gentle and natural in action; they are cheap, easily available, to be had almost

for the cost of gathering them. But no, all that will not do. They are not western. "Give me English medicine," as a sick servant of mine said, for faith in his own had gone. And so the dispensaries distribute, and private persons purchase, western allopathic medicine brought from thousands of miles away, at a cost which, compared with the local remedies is great. To buy imported medicine's, imported cloths, and other imported articles will not enrich the purchasers. Yet they talk of being poor. Of some foreign things it may be said that they are better, but of many another, such as the herbal and other remedies of this country, it is not so. One of the things I most regret is the neglect of Ayurvedic teaching, the loss of valuable remedies, and of the great experience and knowledge of the pulse of the best old time Kaviraj. I hear now of factories of Indian drugs. The western idea again. But no factory can equal the hand preparation of Indian remedies extending over great lengths of time. The iron, which is in Yogendrarasa, should be burnt

a thousand times. The charitable dispensary with its imported medicine is but only one out of many instances of that lack of faith in ones's own, which is one of the most obvious causes of the inert and dependent condition of this country. A man or people who have no faith in themselves will not, and do not deserve to, succeed. For he who has no such faith must lean on another. A man who says he is not fit to do a thing, cannot do it. Meanwhile if people prefer imported medicine and being opened out with great skill by western surgeons and their Indian disciples ("operation successful but patient dies") that is their affair. It may be that surgical operations are in some cases and in the last resort necessary. But the country can get along without foreign drugs. Perhaps some European with his enterprise and ability will take in hand the indigenous drug. He will probably then find the usual imitators. Some time back an Indian friend told me that a German traveller had taken away from the Kangra valley a number of rare Rasayana Tantras. Why, asked my friend sarcasti-

cally, was he troubling his head over things which had been "exploded by science," for to many science is always "exploding" something or other. His reply was instructive. "We will perhaps recast what is there and send it back to your country." Those who now reject will certainly receive anything Indian if it is presented with a western imprimatur. Even the Upanishads had need of such a chit. Though its adherents do not recognise it, this chit-system is symbolic of a wide-spread evil —the dependence on what others and not we ourselves approve. To those who think and act rightly according to their conscience, what matters it what others say? A man of sense after fifty learns how much that is worthless is being said everywhere. This is not an invitation to self-conceit and bounce, often successful though the latter be. Over-confidence is an error, but it is an error on the right side.

A last word as to a remedy. So far as the universe is concerned the basis of all things is Power as Will—the Will of the

One to become and to exist as Many. According to Shâkta teaching, each man is a section or part (Angsha) of the whole (Pûrna). Every individual centre is therefore a limited expression of the Root Will. Without subscribing to all the teachings of Western Voluntarism we may yet affirm the Will to be the fundamental fact. All lack of faith and surrender is due to the absence of, or weakness of, Will. No soul ever overcomes another. What is overcoming in the one is *surrender* of Will in the other. From the broadest standpoint, any defeat is deserved, and so is every subordination. Those reap the fruits of power, which is freedom of action and development, who are powerful. To an immense amount of futile discussion we can reply *solvitur ambulando.* Where there is Power, Life is intense, for Life is a Power (Prânashakti). True, any sort of life is an expression of Power, for all is that. But it is Power at its weakest, merely sustaining itself, feebly holding on without utility and creativeness. The Power of which I speak is Power at the

full strength of the capacity of the form in which it is displayed. Power includes not merely physical force, but intellectual and moral might. The first achieves little without the second, and neither achieve what is lasting and of worth without the third. That Might may permanently avail there must be Right. The will of India should be strong, enduring, massive, adamant to wrongful assault, but beneficent—the kind of massive power which is suggested by the figure of Kapila carved on the rocks of Ceylon. Therefore the mind must be purified. This if attained is true Power, not merely material power. By this Chittashudhi man discovers and gives play to the Grand Will of which he is a mode. His will is warmed and strengthened by contact with the Central Fire as Will. His Will is not something colourless and abstract. It is a particular, individual, and racial Will. The particular Will may be upheld without trampling on, or like injury to, others. Because Will is weak, we hear the query "what shall we do to be saved?" The

really living centres of Power do not ask questions but save themselves. They do that because they have *faith* in *themselves*, *faith* in their *fellows*, *faith* in the *race* of which they are a member, *faith* in the *civilisation* it has evolved. Is it possible to say that if this country and its people had had such *faith* it would have been in the position in which it now is? Has it been true to the principles of its civilization? I frequently come across persons who are apathetic, or despair of this country. It is the fact and a sure fact that those who believe they are going down, will go down. He who says he is not fit is by that very fact unfit. He who says he is weak is in fact so. As I have elsewhere said, we have no right to make prophecies of the future to establish the futility of present endeavour. Even if it were a fact, which no one can with certainty say, that Indian civilization is about to be broken up, those who belong to the latter are bound to uphold their own to the full extent of their power, for Nature's right working is dependent on the perfect and un-

failing adherence of each to his own Dharma.

Those who fall from their Type, and who desert their own, are extinguished. They lose all independent existence, and are absorbed and become part of some other civilization of which they are the food. From the world-standpoint, there is no reason to complain of this, for the worthy are those who have moral strength to support themselves and do so. Each however of the persons concerned in the conflict of cultures must elect either to withstand or submit. Those who look at things objectively, as foreigners can readily do of civilizations other than their own, will not lament when any particular civilization disappears for they know that that fact is proof that it was not fit to survive. Nature throws away all those who will not play the part which She has assigned to them. But those who truly belong to that civilization and are loyal to it, as also others who feel with and for that civilization, will sorrow for the weakness, faint heartedness, or surrender, as the case may be, which is the ground of Nature's

sentence. The lamp of life is handed to each. The greatest of Sâdhanâs is the Sâdhan of Power as Life, of That which is Prâna Prânasya or the Life of all lives. There is no need to trouble. For if India does not uphold what of worth was entrusted to her, others who are faithful to true life will do so. But that fact does not dispense any from taking care that the life-current flows in the river bed of what they believe to be their Dharma. And this is the point on which we must ponder.

For I clearly see that if the governing principles of Indian Civilisation productive of the essentials of Indian character suffer defeat in the country of their origin, it will not be (in any ultimate sense) at any foreign hands *but at its own.* As I have long foreseen and said in my "Is India Civilised?"—never has it been in such a danger as at the present time, when disruptive forces alien to the true Indian spirit have commenced their work. Those who have hitherto failed to perceive the necessity for the preservation of Indian tradition may yet live to see the ripened

fruit of their misjudgment or negligence. The word of India (so characteristic of Her) is Shânti. Without a doubt they who wish for it will have it. But the word will not do unless we so act for others and ourselves as to secure what it spells. My last word here then is, "Food is Power." "Feed the poor." I constantly hear of their distress. Those who can and will not help will rue it. For Immanent Justice is now hard at work throughout the whole world. When both are rightly understood, religion and self-interest are identical. This is a very obvious instance of it.

Help however does not require that any person should be placed in a position for which Nature has not fitted him. Doctrinaire "Uplifters" may be reminded of the following story illustrative of the truth that the low, who are promoted beyond their deserts, will destroy those who "uplift" them.

A Rishi in his Ashrama observed a Mouse to be in great fear of a Cat. Taking pity on the animal, he changed it into a

Cat. But a Dog then appeared who was about to attack the Cat. Taking pity again he turned the Cat into a Bitch. A Dog, as is well known, will not fight a female of its species. Last of all a Lion appeared who was about to eat the Bitch, on which the Rishi said, "Become a Lioness." With her the Lion became friendly. After a few days the Lioness thought to herself "why should I trouble to go out and hunt for my food. The Rishi here is very handy:" on hearing which the latter said, "you become a Mouse again."

Help like all our other actions must be intelligent.

Calcutta,
28th June 1921.

J. W.

BHARATA SHAKTI

FOOD IS POWER—AGRICULTURE

[*The following address was delivered by Sir John Woodroffe as President of the All-India Cow Conference, held at Calcutta, in 1917.*]

In opening this Conference I desire to say something as to its objects. These are set out in the official statement issued by the organisers to which I will first refer.

1. The object of this Conference is neither political nor religious but economic. It is hoped therefore that all sections of the Indian people whether they are Hindus, Mohammedans, Christians or members of any other community, will cheerfully accord their adhesion to it and will heartily co-operate for its success.

2. The promoters of the Conference propose to invite delegates from all parts of India to assemble in Calcutta next December at about the time when the meeting of the Indian National Congress will take place. They therefore desire to form a suitable Reception Committee in which all sections of the Indian people shall be represented.

3. The main purpose of the Conference will be to devise ways and means for the improvement of agriculture, for the protection and improvement of cattle, specially of cows and for the production of pure ghee.

4. It is desired that the Conference will urge the authorities to make due provision for pasture-lands in every part of India and also to afford facilities for the improvement of the breeds of cattle.

5. It will be desirable for the Conference to take steps for the purpose of opening a model dairy farm within easy reach of Calcutta, where dairying operations will be carried on with a view to induce others to establish similar model farms in other

parts of India and to demonstrate that pure milk and ghee can be supplied on commercial lines to large towns.

6. The recent legislation in Bengal to prevent the sale of adulterated ghee is considered an inadequate remedy. It has, however, brought prominently before the public the immediate necessity of a conference to devise adequate means for the removal of an admitted evil.

It will be observed from what I have said that the objects of this Conference are neither political nor religious. Personally I believe that there is no question which does not ultimately touch religion. All who act humanely towards animals, whether they kill them or not, are, to the degree of their humanity, religious in its most essential sense; as are also all those who co-operate with one another for the general good or render honest service. Economics alone are neither a sufficient incentive nor sanction. What is meant is that it is not desired to discuss here any matter which is the subject of dispute between adherents of different forms of

religion. In this country, as we all know, that beneficient animal, the cow, is sacred to the Hindus and therefore the question of its killing is the subject of dispute with the Mussalman Community. The mention of the word "Cow" together with the preponderance of Hindus in this Conference has been the cause of suspicion in the minds of some. These suspicions are without grounds. If in fact the quantity and quality of cattle be improved, there will be more cattle to be killed for food by those who wish to do so. All communities are, in varying ways, interested in the question we are about to discuss, whether such community be Hindu, Mussalman or Christian. To some cattle are food. For all, it is the source of milk, butter and ghee. Milk is the staple food of all children in this country as elsewhere. Most adults take milk, butter and ghee: a great deal is taken with tea, the consumption of which is increasing, and it is used in the making of sweetmeats so largely consumed by all classes in India. Nextly, all in this country use cattle and not horses for the plough.

We have therefore in our Committee both Christians and Moslems. Particular thanks are due to the latter gentlemen who have not feared to give us their support and have not been frightened away by their suspicions on hearing the word "Cow." The Conference thanks all its members for their support and, as President, I must ask them to observe the terms on which the adherence of the non-Hindu members has been given, namely, that we should, so far as this Conference is concerned, approach the matter from that economic platform on which all can stand. This will be the easier as we are not here to discuss the question of the raising of cattle for food, but the question of their raising for plough and dairy purposes.

Some years ago, a foreign professor was walking with an Indian friend of mine on the Maidan amidst some of the poor creatures emaciated, with stunted and broken and crooked horns, which we all unfortunately encounter in our walks. The professor said "Look how this country has degenerated: even its cows cannot

grow horns." The remark was really a profound one. Where the cattle are good, there the country is prosperous. Any one who pursues this subject will find poverty, ignorance, neglect and in some cases even cruelty, as against some goodwill, sense, and humanity evidenced by the 555 Pinjra-poles and Goshälas in this country, though in the latter there is much room for improvement. Neglect and cruelty exist, notwithstanding talk about the sanctity of the cow. From one point of view the worst cases are not the disgusting and cruel practices of the Goalas, who are mere tradesmen seeking to get all they can, humanity and morality notwithstanding, nor the callousness of ignorant carters : but the indifference and neglect of some of the Bhadralog who should know and do better. Thus I am told that, now-a-days, in some Indian households the ladies, abandoning their Eastern ideas and customs, cease to attend to their cows as their mothers and grandmothers did, but leave them (in what I suppose they think is the memsahib fashion) to the care of their servants. Such work

is now considered beneath them. The result is likely to be, and I am told often is, neglect, ill-treatment and some degree of starvation. Calves, also it seems, are often starved of the milk they should get, and dry and old cows being deemed useless are held worthy of no consideration. Dr. Joshi says that the city Goalas do not generally rear calves as there is no money in it. As a rule they are allowed to die of neglect and in some places they are even thrown alive into the dustbin. How can we expect good where such horrid evil is practised? How different and superior, though extreme, is the attitude of the primitive Kol who is unwilling to drink milk because to do so is to deprive the calf of what nature intended for it: or of the old Moslem lady of noble family who, when her son, at the instance of the English Collector, wanted to sell and kill his dry cows on the ground of their uselessness, answered "Then you can commence with me." All these are not mere symbols of a degeneracy but standing examples of it. That this Conference, which has been

desired and wished for by some for years past, has at length come, is a proof at least of a revived interest and desire to remedy the evil. Do not, however, let it end in words. Do not even let us be too ambitious, and achievement is nearer to us. Fertility in great ideas is not enough without the actions which realise them. We do not want resplendent fireworks which fizzle out to a cold cardboard or stick, but a warm, bright and enduring light whatever its dimensions may be. Government, as the reports show, have been working at the subject for years past. It cannot achieve what it desires without public co-operation. Let us resolve then to give it.

Though I can claim no expert knowledge on the subject I am pleased that you have offered me the opportunity of saying a word upon it. For, in my opinion a fundamental problem for India at present to solve is the material one, namely, how to feed its people. This has long been demanding a solution which has become the more urgent owing to the present great war and the dearth of food and possibly worldwide

famine it threatens. Others are engaged in the general question of India's food products. We are concerned with some of the most important of these, namely, milk, butter and ghee. The lack of activity in this country which is observed in many cases is by some ascribed to the climate. This, like everything else, has its influence. It is not, however, a sufficient cause seeing that it has always existed, whereas the effect ascribed to it, has not. We must attribute deficiency of vitality not to any defect inherent in the Indian character or its climatic environment but to the want of food, water, pure air and sanitation. Many will have observed a prevailing listlessness. This is due to ill health. It is no use making complaint or even prescribing lofty medicines when food is wanting. The body cannot in such case have health. There is lack of activity and still less surplus activity. Nor can we truly think without sufficiency of food. India wants more Power (Shakti) as I have often said. That power is ultimately based in a material sense on food, the source on this plane of all

psychical and material energy. How food, air, water, exercise and a healthy life work is shown, as several of my friends have observed, in the case of the newly-raised Bengali Battalions. They tell me that the young men who have enlisted were transformed. Why ? There is no other mysterious cause than food, air and the exercise which food enables them to take. If India is fed, India will be herself again, and will be strong of mind and body. I read the other day an article by an Indian author in which it was said that sick-mindedness was justified. This I must deny. No one should be sick of mind. If he is, there is something wrong with him. The question of food is therefore of prime importance for India's future. At the back of the food problem is the essential poverty of India, and at the back of that, causes into which I cannot here enter, even though at the risk of that superficiality and that plastering and patching which marks the work of those who do not think, or if they do, cannot for various reasons probe to the ultimate root. Here by the terms under

which we meet we are limited to an economic discussion unaffected by political or other issues. We are to-day particularly concerned with that healthy and strength-giving element milk and its products, the staple food (when they can get it) of millions in this largely vegetarian country. It has been said that the milk problem may appear simple to the casual observer being only a part of the larger problem of pure food. A deeper study however will disclose the fact that the milk problem is one of the most complex in public sanitation. There are several reasons which Dr. Joshi has pointed out why we have a milk problem. In the first place milk is an almost universal article of human food. Secondly it is likely to convey disease directly by pathogenic microbes (as in the case of tuberculosis) when it is polluted, or to cause it indirectly (as in the case of rickets) when it is adulterated. In one Indian city 4/5ths of the milk supply was found on an examination of 1,400 samples to be adulterated with water and 90% to be contaminated with microbes, indicating the presence of dirt.

Thirdly it has been hitherto found to be extremely difficult to obtain milk which has been handled with care and cleanliness. Fourthly in this climate milk decomposes more quickly than any other food. Hence it may be assumed that every sample of milk is likely to become dangerous to health. It is not surprising, therefore, to find that Dr. Turner, the executive Health Officer of Bombay, speaking of the very unsatisfactory state of the milk supply in the large towns of India. Though the evil is naturally more acute in the large cities, the milk problem in other parts of the country also urgently calls for attention. The shortage of pure milk and the adulteration of ghee has brought the matter before every one's mind. There can be no question as to the necessity of our deliberations if we survey past and present conditions. By past conditions I do not mean some golden age fancied or real but a past known even to those now living. Men of fifty can remember a time when cow's milk could be had 32 seers for a rupee and one or two seers could be had for the

mere asking. Now milk has risen enormously in price and it is difficult to get it pure at any cost. It has been said to be extremely difficult to get, at least in the towns, genuine milk at less than about four annas a seer and that this rate is higher than in most large European and American cities. It has been pointed out that this indicates that there is something radically wrong in the cost of production and distribution of milk particularly when it is remembered that labour is cheaper in India than in Europe or America. The price of good animals has also considerably risen recently. The problem weighs most heavily on the poor but many experience a difficulty in getting milk of any kind at all. Some poor children even get no milk, being fed on a rice decoction (Chura) or rice-flour and water (Petuli). As to the milk problem in Indian cities, see Dr. Joshi's work so entitled. The question is, as I have said, of the greater importance owing to the large part which milk takes in the Indian dietary which is chiefly vegetarian. As regards the number of cattle I have not got

the satistics for the whole of India: but to take one instance; the provincial report of the United Province shows that between 1904 and 1915 there has been a decrease in bullocks, cows and young stock of 6, 5½ and 1½ lakhs respectively. But whether the total number of cattle have increased or decreased it seems to be the fact that Indian milch cattle show a deterioration in quality and that the number of good animals is rapidly diminishing. But this is not all; for what cattle exist are inferior.

The shortage in the supply of milk seems to be mainly due to two causes, namely diminution in the number of cows and in their milk-producing capacity but chiefly to the latter cause. Those causes again are mainly due to four others *viz.*, bad breeding, insufficient and improper fodder, improper treatment, disease and premature death, and the slaughter of prime cows and calves.

I do not intend to enter exhaustively into the causes of the evils complained of and still less to deal with all the various remedies which have been proposed. I

have not the knowledge which entitles me to speak with authority. These things are for practical men and the expert, many of whom are amongst you. Moreover even amongst the experts there is diversity of opinion upon most of these matters. Thus all who have spoken to me on the subject regard the possession of pasture lands of prime importance. But Dr. Voelcker in his Report on the improvement of Indian Agriculture does not regard them to be an absolute necessity and states that it is not always where grazing is the most plentiful that the best cattle are to be found. Again on the subject of breeding to which I first turn, there are, as you are aware, different schools of opinion favouring the crossing of indigenous stocks and crossing with imported stocks respectively. All such details must be dealt with elsewhere. I merely indicate in the most general way some of the points which require attention.

It is obvious that in the first instance we must see to the parents of the future animal by developing and providing good

breeding bulls and improving and selecting the cows. As cows and bullocks are needed in this country for the two purposes of milking and draughting, the aim has been well stated to be, the production of a good milking cow and an efficient draught bullock. The bulls should be selected from pure breeds of good milking qualities. Steps must be taken to remedy the deficiency which now exists in suitable breeding bulls. Mr. Blackwood, the Director of Agriculture, Bengal, in his Survey and Census states the circumstances adverse to cattle-breeding in this Province to be the climate, deficiency of pasture, deficiency of suitable breeding bulls, covering by immature bulls, diminution of Brahmani bulls and the starvation of calves which is one of the chief adverse influences tending to diminish the vitality of cattle. As to these matters I will say a word on that one of them which is known to me, namely, decrease in Brahmani bulls, which the Director thinks is due largely to encroachment on pasture lands. There is, however, another and I think perhaps more operative

cause. The High Courts have ruled that the Bulls which Hindus dedicate at *Shraddha,* which were allowed to roam about and were used for breeding purposes by the villages in which they were, are *res nullius* or no man's property. The result, of course, is that any one may take and kill them. Some are put in the scavenging carts; others, I am told, are slaughtered by the Butchers. These High Court decisions are an apt illustration of the harm which follows the rigid application of foreign legal ideas to this country. The piety which dedicates a bull to public uses is not known to English law; but that is no reason why its beneficial results should be frustrated. I understand that the Hon'ble Mr. K. K. Chanda has accordingly brought forward a Bill to remedy the evil produced by these decisions (which though good law are not good sense) and which proposes to vest the Bulls in some authority who will maintain them for breeding purposes. I doubt myself whether great reliance can be placed on the Brahmani Bull. The piety which set him at large is itself on the decline

together with other pieties so useful to the public such as the dedication of tanks, the planting of trees and so forth which marked the practical religious sense of past generations. Under these circumstances it is doubtful whether the supply of Brahmani Bulls will continue. Now-a-days there is a widespread tendency to give nothing, bulls or anything else, for nothing.

We must look now-a-days, it seems, to Economics, which after all only means that we must see what pays and must appeal to the self-interest of the public whose actions may be prompted by facilities given to the breeders and supported by Government breeding farms and other aids.

It is, however, no use breeding a good animal if it is not *properly fed.* Defective feeding and careless tending is partly responsible for the deterioration of Indian milch cattle. The former, it is said, is common among small owners in the country, while the latter is to be seen in some large dairy farms (as in other places) where the hired men do not care to tend the

animals properly. This latter is only one of many instances of that dishonest or neglectful service which is the cause of so many of the evils which we wish to see away and which can itself only be remedied by a moral and not a mere economic appeal.

Here we must consider the two questions of pasture-lands and the raising of fodder crops. Mr. Blackwood says that the most important of circumstances (other than climate) adverse to cattle-breeding in Bengal is undoubtedly the deficiency of pasture and that this fact is well known to the ordinary cultivator who usually puts it forward when asked as to the cause of the degeneration of cattle. He says that several proposals have been suggested, but that (in his opinion) most of them show a want of appreciation of what is practicable and that some would do more harm than good. I refer you to his survey on this point. The wisdom of the ancient Smritis provided that for every village and township a certain amount of common pasture-land should be set apart. In recent times

there has been great encroachment on these lands. This depredation on public property is assigned to economic reasons, it being said to be more profitable to the smaller men to cultivate the land than to keep it for grazing. In this case the desire for economic gain leads to the taking of other people's property. It seems to be generally agreed that more ample facilities should be granted for the grazing of cattle; but there seems also to be much difference of opinion (due in part to conflicting interests) as to how this is to be given effect to. Some have suggested legislative action to protect grazing grounds and that steps should be taken to recover the encroached lands. Others propose that the Government should acquire from public funds new grazing grounds thus making the community generally pay for what was wrongly taken and should be restored. It has been even said that these depredations are economically justifiable and should not be interfered with: for, this would be to frustrate an economic tendency which is a dangerous thing now-a-days. It is said

further, that as cattle are necessary for cultivation, the tendency will necessarily be for the price of cattle to rise as further encroachments are made on the existing remnant of grazing land until, as remarked by Mr. Moreland, "the necessary adjustment of prices ensures the retention of waste land in grazing." Mr. Blackwood is of opinion "that though cattle will suffer to some extent in the process, it does not appear possible for Government to prevent it; nor, considering the difficulties in the way, does it seem desirable to do so." He suggests a solution by the growing of fodder crops such as jowar, lucerne and the like, or by mixed farming, the main principle of which is to have grazing and cropping alternately. By throwing land into grazing it gets a rest and the manure obtained from the cattle is valuable for the purpose of fertilizing the soil of future crops. He, however, says that the latter cannot be carried out by raiyats cultivating small holdings. Something, however, must be done, and if pasture lands are to be recovered or acquired, it has been suggested

to me that one-tenth of the quantity of arable land, along with a tank, should be reserved for each village. At present the cattle get insufficient food and the plough cattle are overworked. It is stated, I think, in the Parashara Smriti, that four pairs of draught oxen were used in olden times so that each pair got a rest. But now-a-days, the same oxen are sometimes used all day and every day. Besides the above suggestion, there is another I may make which is not economic, but which, I trust, is not too idealistic: that is, to ask those in possession of public lands to restore them to the public use from which they have been wrongly taken. There is some hope that if appeal were made in the proper spirit, and the matter was explained as one affecting the interests of society at large, it would meet with other than a selfish response. I understand that a Pasture Society has been started at Patna by Sj. Bal Krishna Das which works on these excellent lines with hitherto considerable success. I may here also mention an association called the Humanita-

rian Association recently started at Howrah. If this course did not meet with success, it might be considered whether the parties encroaching should not be made to disgorge. What is really wanted in this, as in other matters, is the diffusion of that corporate spirit of public welfare which will smother under disgrace all mean self-seeking. Want of productivity of the land is due to lack of agricultural knowledge.

Then there is the *improper treatment of cattle in health and disease.* This is a matter which calls for the spread of agricultural knowledge in the schools, colleges and universities which, besides professorships, might establish the agricultural travelling lectureships which exists in America. This is more useful knowledge, under the circumstances, than the law which is now over much fostered. Hundreds of lawyers are being turned out every year. No one really wants them and a large number of the unfortunate ones do not want themselves. There may be at first some difficulty in turning minds away from visionary Deputy Magistracies.

and other forms of official but dependent service; but starvation will effect this cure. A time is coming when every one will have to work in any way available to him. Want will produce sense. Meanwhile education may be spread by means of works in the vernacular such as Gopala Bandhava by Sj. Prokash Chandra Sirkar and Godhan by Sj. Grish Chandra Chakravartti which have come to my notice, though there may be others. I would, however, say to these authors and others:—Do not neglect the old works because of the new. See what the ancients said and did. After all the country then did well in these respects, and if so, it is because its people had knowledge. Consult, for instance, the Brihat Samhita of Varahamihira. Even now there are many who are versed in the ancient Gochikitsa. All this must, of course, be re-enforced by the scientific knowledge of modern times. Besides such books, pamphlets in the vernacular may be widely distributed. Something is, I understand, being done in this respect by the Agricultural Department; but I am told

that the pamphlets are not sufficiently circulated, but supplied only to those who ask for them. If it be generally useless to force knowledge on those who do not wish for it, there is no harm in thrusting upon them the opportunity of gaining it. This literature might teach the prevention and treatment of, at least, the commoner diseases. The number of Veterinary Surgeons may, it is said, be usefully increased. I cannot speak as to this and am personally averse to the multiplication of officials of any kind. It might, however, be advantageous to encourage private veterinary practice. In any case it would be useful to distribute lists of persons in each Province who know how to treat cattle according to the Indian and European methods together with their addresses. Do not let the old knowledge die as has, to some degree, occurred in the case of the Kabiraj. The ancients may not have known all that the years which followed them have told us ; but they were not the fools which the entire neglect of the past on the part of some seems to indicate.

Want of proper treatment has led to *premature and avoidable death.* This is due to bad breeding (producing a weak stock), improper treatment, insufficiency and unsuitability of fodder (particularly in the case of cows carrying calf) and want of exercise for cows and calves in Calcutta and other towns.

There is, lastly, the *slaughter of prime cows and calves,* that is, cows which have not calved, say thrice, or whose milking capacity has not ceased to decline and cow-calves capable of themselves bearing. Some time ago the Calcutta Municipality attempted to stem this slaughter by increasing the fees, but there was a "howl" (as it is called) before which it is customary now-a-days hurriedly to retire. There will always be a " howl " from people whose interests are affected. It is, however, the business of the community to enforce what is for the public good whatever private interests may stand in the way. This is the essence of respected rule. This question is of prime importance, for, the best milkers are being sent to the towns

and when their milk declines are being slaughtered in large numbers. The result of course, is that the numbers of best cows are being diminished. So far as I know this problem is peculiar to this country. In Europe, America, and the Colonies cattle are raised for two distinct purposes, namely, beef-cattle for food and dairy cattle for milk. No one ordinarily thinks of sacrificing a good dairy cow; and if dairy cows were killed there would be no need to do so in any quantity owing to the fact of the existence of beef-cattle. If calves are slaughtered it is bull calves. Beef is not consumed in this country except practically by the European civilian population and by the European army. So the Indian people have hitherto not had the necessity of breeding cattle for that purpose as in Europe and America. But beef is required for the communities I have mentioned. The Government, I understand, refused (on what ground I do not know) to import the beef required for the army which, if done, would have largely checked the slaughter of Indian cattle.

The Indian people are, for the most part, vegetarian or, at any rate, moderate animal-eaters, and for them the cattle are useful for draught or dairy. As there is no breeding for specific beef purposes, what appears to be taking place is an encroachment on draught and dairy cattle in the interests of those who require cattle for meat. But why should one interest be sacrificed to the other ? As a portion of the community eat beef the slaughter must go on, but those who are interested in the milk-supply may rightly insist that they should not be made to suffer. Three remedies suggest themselves to me. The first is that Government should import its meat for the European troops in which case there would be only the limited European needs of the towns to be considered ; the second is to define the age at which dairy cows can be slaughtered, fixing it with reference to the period when their milking capacity declines; the third is that Government should be asked, or private parties be encouraged by the meat-eating public, to start in this country a specific

beef raising industry so that it will become unnecessary to have recourse to milch cows for slaughter. It is to be noted also, that Indian cattle are exported for foreign countries and this might be stopped or regulated.

Lastly, the object of this Conference mentions *the establishment of dairy farms.* Particularly is this necessary in the case of big towns. It has been suggested that the Municipalities should prevent the keeping of cows in towns. They are badly housed, crowded and cannot take exercise. Their surroundings, as is well known, are often repulsively dirty. The Goalas maltreat the animals practising the abominable *phuka* process. It is true this is forbidden. But this and all other cruelty to animals should be more severely punished; as also, still more so, any connivance by Municipal underlings at this and other breaches of the law. So far as is possible the matter should be removed from the control of ignorant self-seeking Goalas with their filthy habits, and the cows transported to the vicinity of

the towns, facilities being given for the milk transport. There the animals can get space and air and can be supervised. Provision might be made for the testing and certification of milk. This question, I know, however, bristles with difficulties and will have to be carefully considered. It is, perhaps, the most urgent question of all, in some ways owing to the increasing congestion in the towns and the great possibility of the dissemination of disease. It is estimated that about three thousand maunds of milk (or stuff so-called) are consumed daily in Calcutta. Milk is not only very dear but inferior, adulterated and contaminated. It has been asked why companies or private capitalists do not come forward to undertake the milk-supply on a large scale. It is true that there are some well-managed European concerns, but these cater only for the well-to do. The Goala supplies milk, or what seems to be such, at a price more suitable to the poor. The reasons why capital does not seem to be attracted is stated in Mr. Blackwood's survey to which I refer you. Until the general

poverty is remedied and other conditions are established favourable to the attraction of private capital, the resolution of the Committee on the milk-supply at the Poona Agricultural Conference seems to call for adoption. "The Committee feel that the securing of an adequate milk-supply is so vital to the health of the people and the future of the community that there is strong reason for Government being prepared to assist in the reorganization of the milk-supply to a greater extent than would be wise in almost any other industry."

These are the main points which it has occurred to me to place before you. There must be, however, others known to you. So far as remedies are concerned, what is essential is feeling and co-operation for the public good. The happy results, which such good-will and work may produce, are shown by, amongst others, the charming picture of the little state of Denmark about which Rai Saheb Chandrika Prasada has written so useful a monograph. Under modern conditions the state is

(whether for good or ill) taking a larger and larger part, but individual effort and adherence to Sva-dharma (which is the old Indian principle) must be encouraged. When these are in full strength they dispense with State help and prevent the rise of those problems which law, economics and other external instruments are called upon (often ineffectively enough) to solve.

Since I wrote the above, Dr. R. B. Naik of Poona has handed me a little pamphlet on "Cow protection in its real sense" in English and Mahratti, which refers to Krishnaji Abaji Guruji's works "How to protect the cows," and from which I learn that Shri Chavande Maharaj has lately founded the Shri Sanatana Govardhana Mahamandala in Poona, and that it is pro-proposed to start as an organ of this Mahamandala a weekly journal "Gorakshana." There are several observations of interest and value in this little work and some of which I cite. He says that the poorer class, though willing, are unable, through poverty, to maintain properly the

cows. The middle and upper classes are ceasing to keep cows in their house though according to the old Pauranik saying "a house where there is no cow is like a shmashâna." The milk required is bought and the cows are maintained by the Goalas who tax them to the uttermost or by poorer folk who, when they cannot sufficiently maintain themselves, cannot feed their cattle. The agricultural class on whom falls the duty of preserving and protecting the cattle is becoming poorer and poorer every day. He cites Professor Knight as saying that degeneracy is taking place by admixture of breeds. As regards fodder, though Japan is in total area only 1/9th of India still the pasture-lands there are nearly half of those in India; that is, the pasture-lands there are four times more than here. Owing to the cost of wood and other fuel, dung is used in lieu of it and there is thus a loss of manure. Even pregnant cows are slaughtered, and calves sent to the butcher as soon as they are born. Some animals are, it is said, flayed alive. Ac-

cording to the report of Mr. Hume, Under-Secretary to the Government of India, vast numbers of cattle are slaughtered every year in India and the export of hides has, it is said, risen from 60 lakhs in 1865-6 to 13 crores in 1914. Mr. Jasawalla has computed that nearly 150,000 cattle are slaughtered in a year for the European soldiers only. The reports show that in one year some ten millions cattle were swept away by epidemic disease. The little work shows the futility, or at least inadequacy, of certain measures adopted to meet the various evils and proposes others which I recommend to your attention.

With the author of this work and the sender of one of the telegrams read to-day I conclude with the wish that God may inspire and sustain our efforts for the prosperity of India—a prosperity which will only come if we show ourselves worthy of it both in the treatment of the cattle and all other animals and in our duties towards our fellow-men.

EDUCATION

At a meeting assembled to hear Professor Pramathanatha Mukhyopadhyaya's paper, "Some Thoughts on Education in India," Sir John Woodroffe made the following speech as Chairman :—

The deeply thought-out paper of Professor Pramathanatha Mukhyopadhyaya which we have just heard read, raises so many points for discussion, that whilst heartily thanking the lecturer for it, I can only make, within the time at your and my disposal, one or two general observations. We must, as my friend the Professor always does, think deeply by going to the root of the subject and then express ourselves lucidly.

What then is Education? A child is born; let us say an Indian child. That

child in its essential nature is, according to your Shastra, infinite will, knowledge and action appearing in mind and body; not abstract mind and body, but a particular, that is Indian, mind and body in which these infinite powers appear in a contracted and peculiar form. Mind and body are each an inheritance from all the Indian Ages, the former being the collectivity of the individual Sangskaras. This mind and body are the subject of Education which consists in their development, that is, the development of Shakti. This is an essential doctrine of Shaktivada. Shakti must be awakened (Prabuddha).

For what end? The true end of Education in every country is to set and keep man in the Spiritual Kingdom. This again is to incite, foster and develop man's spiritual nature. Mind and body must express the Spirit of which they are a manifestation. Education must therefore be religious as the Professor has said. The notion that we can dispense with religion, and rely on ethics, economics or what not, alone, is a modern delusion.

due to half-thinking and the absurd notion that there can be any "neutrality" (as it is called) touching religion. How can man be neutral as regards God? One seems to hear Cosmic Laughter at the mere suggestion. An agreement not to mention God is in itself a breach of neutrality, in that it is an offence against religion. Who is not for Religion is against it. I am not speaking of any particular *form* of it. The State should therefore support every form of Religion. Each Religion should have its own schools, even if this involves, as it does, the strengthening of non-christian Religions. To refuse State support on this ground would be not "neutrality," but the reverse of it under the pretended guise of impartiality. The attendance of children of one religion at the schools of others is apt to produce indifferent men and women. Those who assent to this are themselves careless of their Religion and suffer from such indifference. I have heard of children, educated at Christian schools, who on return to their homes speak of, or look upon their

parents as "heathen." Such parents merit the reproach which their own conduct has called upon them. If it be said (as some do) that there are no suitable Hindu schools, the answer is that those who really care for their faith and traditions should supply them.

As the lecturer has said the inherent mentality of India is spiritual. There is however, a present tendency (as I pointed out the other day) in some quarters to speak of Indian "spirituality" in inverted commas. This is a manifestation of the great conflict of world-cultures which has always existed, but is now becoming, and will, after the War, become still more intense. This is a question profoundly important into which I cannot enter here. It is sufficient to say that, so far as India is concerned, the matter has passed through three stages; first of indifference or that benevolent patronage which we are all apt to give to what is weaker than ourselves and does not therefore threaten our interest; secondly more active opposition as the strength of Indian culture was

recognised; and lastly the more dangerous tactic which consists in inviting the Indian people themselves to commit a "cultural suicide" to use the lecturer's apt term.

The ultimate end of Education is not, as it has been truly said, the mere quest for bread and butter. Material happiness is not to be neglected, nor is it likely to be. It however follows in the wake of any people who set their minds on, and actions in conformity with, the Spiritual Ground of all such material or mental happiness. It will come in this way and not by a direct search for it with neglect of its true Cause. But whilst the end sought by true Education is one, its subject as mind and body varies both in individuals and in races. This statement is not more obvious than the conclusions which follow upon it. A race, naturally, and therefore best, functions on the lines of its inheritance. Other things being equal, an Educator of the same race as the pupil, and exemplifying its culture, is better than another. Each people best know how to

get what their nature truly wants. Upon these and other equally obvious consideration the necessity for Education upon National lines (which is now being so much agitated) is based. I am cordially at one with those who demand it.

But what are the actual facts? An Asiatic people is ruled by a Western race which (subject perhaps to some common elements of "Aryanism") is foreign to it in body, mind, custom and culture. In fact it has been well said that there are not two more dissimilar types than that of a Hindu and an Englishman. The latter however essays to teach the former. How can he do so except by ignoring your culture, with which generally he is not conversant, and by implanting in its stead his own? This is a perfectly natural process on his part, and there is nothing "wicked" about it. By this nevertheless, many of you are de-racialized and denationalized. Up-to-now however, foreign Education has been justified by the fact that it has held its own and that those to whom it was applied in general

approved of it. If you disregard or belittle your culture it is only possible for us to give you our own. Is it likely that an English Educator will consider of value what you yourselves neglect? Even now there are among you those who seek "Indian Etons" and the like. Such persons have always been ready to give up their old lamps for new. Thus again the question of the encouragement of the vernaculars is now being discussed. I am informed that a strong opposition to this policy is to be found among some of yourselves. A friend told me the other day that at a debate in this city all the English speakers were in favour of the vernaculars and opposition came from the Bengali speakers. To us with our strong national sentiment, it is inconceivable how any one can prefer a foreign to his native tongue. Here I may incidentally observe that encouragement of the vernaculars does not necessarily mean neglect of English or other foreign language. Most educated Europeans know one or more foreign languages besides their own.

I wish here to say a word on the Professor's thoroughly called-for precaution against a thoughtless policy of drift. There are everywhere a class of indolent people without will and strength, who consider that it is not worth while to act because they think that the stream of tendency and future events are, and will be, against them. So there have been political Conservatives who have thought it was useless to assert their convictions because of their belief that "popular" principles must triumph. To such persons Lord Salisbury is said to have replied in substance as follows: "You have no right to assume what the future will be. It is your duty to act as you honestly believe. Even if it were the fact that your opponents must ultimately triumph, it is only designed that they shall so triumph after they have conquered every obstacle which it is your duty to put in their way. It is thus that Nature protects herself against what is premature."

In the same way there are persons who think that this country must be western-

ized; that its natural collectivist spirit must go, yielding to western individualism and so on. How do you know with certainty what the future will bring? The great War has upset and will upset many fancies concerning the future. Can it be said even now that Individualism is as strong as it was and that the current in the West is not towards some form of Collectivism? It is thus the duty of every Hindu, Mahommedan, Christian or other to do *now* what he feels to be right, whatever his fancies about the *future* may be. Moreover the present and the future are made by ourselves and no one else. Drift is the movement of all which is weak and worthless.

There is, now, however, a turn in the tide due to a rising self-respect on the one hand, and on the other to the spectacle of (to use the language of Professor Mukhyopadhyaya) the "exemplar-civilization" being blown into smoke by its own guns. This will make even the uncritical admirer of all that is western, pause and think. What then is to be done? Professor Mukhyopadhaya has

made some detailed suggestions which are all worthy of careful consideration, though certain of them may be thought by some to involve a too great " throw-back " to be practical, under present conditions. I do not say that this is involved. I do not discuss this point nor some others to which I do not give entire assent. I will only say here what Svami Vivekananda said about the woman-question in India, though I am not referring to that question here. It is difficult to mark out beforehand hard and fast plans to meet all circumstances. What we can do in the first instance is to help the people to get a fair education and to put before them their own cultural inheritance. Invite them, first, to *steep* (I repeat the word *steep*) *their minds in it*, and then let them work out the solution of their own problems. If they will understand and accept the seed of their culture, that seed *will itself grow* into a Tree which will flourish in the surroundings in which it is. I am thankful, as I am sure all are, to Professor Mukhyopadhyaya for the deep and

patriotic presentment of the problem and its solution which we have heard to-day. .

IMITATION AND INDEPENDENCE

The Sixth Anniversary meeting of Friends' Union Club, was held at Calcutta on 30th May, 1916, when Sir John Woodroffe, the President, delivered the following address :—

I thank you for the honour you have done me. I have not hitherto generally presided at meetings as I have other work to do. This is doubtless social service: but one cannot render it in all kinds. However, the solicitation of a friend and interest in the student has brought me here this day—the more readily that the students had lately been severely spoken of. I feel more happy when in the company of students than in most places: for youth with its "*balabuddhi*," to which your Sanskrit address referred, is both sincere and hopeful—the two qualities

which a large number of people lose as they grow up through their ambitions and delusions. (Only a week ago, an Indian friend, perhaps under the influence of the abnormal heat) said to me:—"This is a dead country" to which I replied that only those are dead, who believe themselves to be so, and asked "Is the Indian student dead?" My friend had to admit that his hopes were there. But I said my confidence was there. This land is not dead. On the contrary it has survived all the great Empires, save that of China, which were its contemporaries in past ages. Egypt, Persia, Babylon, Greece and Rome live only in their influence upon the civilizations which succeeded them. India is yet alive, though not fully awake to-day. It is precisely because it is a *living force* that it provokes antagonism from those, who dislike or fear its culture. Does any one now fume against or ridicule the life and morals of Egypt or Babylon? They and other past civilizations are left, as things which are dead and gone, to the scientific dissection of the cool historian.

But, when touching India, even scholars cannot be impartial. Why ? Because India is not the mere subject of academic talk, but is a living force. India is still feared where She is not loved. Why again ? Precisely because She lives: because She is still potentially powerful to impose Her ideas upon the world. She is still an antagonist to be reckoned with in the conflict of cultures. Why has She, with Her civilization so unique, so different from any other of East or West, been preserved ? India lives because of the world-purpose which She has to fulfil: because the world will be enriched by what She can give to it. The Indian youth of to-day are the custodians of this treasure. Proud of their guardianship let them cast aside false shame of themselves and of their own as also all fear and sloth.

The students have been much criticised of late: but if I judge them right, they will not be depressed over it. For my part I am not alarmed at their condition. Nothing in the world is perfect, nor wholly worthless as the Sanskrit proverb

ran. Every good quality carries with it the liability to certain defects. The broad way of looking at matters is to see whether the qualities outweighed the defects. The students had faults (who has not ?) but these were connected with certain qualities of energy and self-respect, which they had acquired, and which are in themselves praiseworthy. Of course, all wished the defects away: but speaking for myself, I would rather they had these faults than that they should be torpid, servile, and lacking in self-respect. For my part I see in the students the commencement of a future of great worth. I am glad to hear that the students have got up the Club themselves. This showed activity and independence and that it was not merely one of those ponds which well-meaning persons had made in order that they might more easily angle for the young idea. They should, however, have a definite notion of what they intended to do. This and other Indian clubs should be centres of Indian life and thought and generators of Indian Power. The world

was a manifestation of Divine power (Shakti) and each man was himself a centre of it, being a fragment (Angsha) of that Great Power. They must be true to the lines on which by the Divine imagining (Kalpana) they had been laid. That is, they must also, like human artists do, *work to type.* This meant they must not imitate any foreign people but be Indian, and shape themselves as such by the study of the literature, art, philosophy and religion of their ancestors. As they knew, they owed a debt to the "Pitris" who would not give their aid if ignored. Each must be true to himself and his type.

Some had become so anglicised that they had almost lost their Indian soul. They thought in English, spoke in English and cut their hair in English, ten annas in front and six annas behind. How was it possible to be true to oneself and yet to be always imitating others? Could all this gain respect? As they asked respect for themselves, they must give it to others, who might rightly incite them to develop new qualities in themselves in forms con-

formable to their own type and nature. But this was a different thing to putting on second hand clothes borrowed from the shop of servile imitation. I have recently read a prospectus of studies for an Indian school, in which there was not a single item which showed that the boys were Indian. By all means, let them learn about, and be helped by, the example of other countries, but let them not forget their own. If they took what others could give, let them assimilate it so that it became not others, but their own. In this way the fire of the Indian spirit would burn all the more intensely by the fuel it fed on. There would then be an Indian "Homa" fed with what was of worth gathered elsewhere. Each should thus realise himself as a centre of Power and firmly work for their own good and that of their country.

What India wanted at present was a *Religion of Power*. The other side of the Spirit She knew better than any. By Power I do not mean merely physical force.

Material force was necessary and ser-

viceable in its way but it must be backed by mental and spiritual force, for man was matter, mind and spirit. The finest modern weapon in the hands of a physically strong man achieves nothing if his head and will be weak. Whence may power be had? India had a well of strength in the Vedantic truth of the Divinity of man. The belief that each man and woman is a Shakti, whose power of accomplishment is only limited by their wills is a faith which will dispel all present weakness and sloth. We are what we have made ourselves in the past. We shall be what we *will* to be. Each must realise himself to be a fragment of the *great Shakti which is India* and then of the Infinite Shakti on whose lap She lies—the Mother of the Universe. I am glad to say that every day such advice as I have to give becomes less necessary. Much progress had been made towards self-realisation during the quarter of a century in which it had been my privilege to live in this sacred country. I am always endeavouring to read the future of it, and nowhere can it be read with greater

certainty than in the minds and bodies of the Indian Student. In the world-play let theirs be a truly Indian part. I conclude with the Sanskrit Mantra from the Yatidharmanirnaya said by Teacher and disciple before the study of the the Vedanta which I say is a fit prayer for all students, and moreover their very own. *Om Saha nâvavatu. Saha nau bhunaktu. Sahavîryyam karavâvahi. Tejasvinâvadhîtam astu Mâ vidvishâvahai,* "May God protect us both. May He grant aid. May we do work with all our strength. May our study be with understanding. May there be no dissension between us."

THE RELIGION OF POWER

[*The following letter appeared in the "Bengali" from the pen of Pramathanatha Mukhyopadhyaya* :—

."A few days back, there appeared in the columns of your much esteemed paper a summary of Sir John Woodroffe's address to students at the Sun Rise Club, on which you wrote a very appreciative leading article. As Sir John spoke of the "Religion of Power" as being the most vital necessity in India's struggle for self-realization, I asked him to explain his meaning more definitely. Sir John wrote in reply the annexed letter which, as I consider it to be a communication of considerable public interest and utility and one supplying a valuable commentary on the original address, I now offer for publication in your columns, Sir John having kindly given his permission to make such offer,"

Sir John Woodroffe wrote as follows :

Thank you for your very interesting letter with which I am in complete con-

formity. What you say as to the function of the British and Indians respectively I have also said in the form that we are a "blister" to which you must react. You have put it in the terms of philosophy. The racial stuff you mention doubtless exists but must be dug out of all the accretions and so allowed to have the play of its true activities. This stuff is, I suppose the collective " Sangskaras " of the race and what springs from their self-activity as distinguished from what is externally imposed or acquired. I am not quite clear about this, but I am working it out on the basis that there is a Collective Soul of the race assuming from time to time various bodies. There is a 'Bija,' but it is difficult to seize and define, though one can feel it without difficulty. I shall be glad of your views on it when, as I hope, we meet in the cold weather.

It is this 'Bija' which is essential and from which all life-growth proceeds, as distinguished from the parasitic growths which fix themselves from without on the trunk. Assimilation to which I referred is

an organic process. Watch an 'Amœba' feeding. The foreign substance is surrounded and then is absorbed into the 'Amœba, when it ceases to be foreign and becomes the 'Amœba' itself. One must allow for free growth; and here some so-called "Orthodox" resistance may have to be overcome. Because bow and arrows were used in the days of the 'Mahabharata,' it is no argument against the use of modern weapons because India did not evolve them. Foreign achievements and culture should be a food for each people--eaten and *assimilated.* Food must be eaten. It used to be said that Greece derived its art from Egypt; but only an expert archæologist could detect this origin by examining Greek art in all its stages. In its finished product how different it seems from Egypt, Hellas having absorbed into herself what she got elsewhere. These are obvious truths to yourself or any other thinker and are acted upon unconsciously by all free organisms which can digest. But in this country the lack for long of a national life has prevented the recognition of these

truths. I am well aware of the bearings of all this on the political question and its possible future results. But the question of political loyalty must not be confounded with the right to the possession of one's soul, even if the complete possession of it may and will alter the political aspect. This however, is a question for the future. Meanwhile the people must first discover their true soul and then develop its powers and not cover themselves with foreign vestures or ornaments. Personally, I regard all this from the human or world aspect. I think the future humanity will be better and richer by the present preservation of various types of culture even if, as many hope, the future amalgamates those cultures in races, which will absorb into themselves the differences which still subsist between the different types. Meanwhile and before the unification each type must perfect itself so as to be a fitting element of the future union.

In this way a man can be both true to the particularities of his race and yet

subserve the purposes of a time in which they may be unknown. Whilst serving ourselves we serve men at large.

What I meant by "Religion of Power" requires some explanation to most; but you will without difficulty understand the few words I write. It seems to me that there are two sides of religion. You have a 'Pravritti Dharma' and a 'Nivritti Dharma.' The former is the Religion of Power—this is the realm of 'Shakti.' On the other side namely, that of the Yati—what is sought is the actionless 'Bhuma,' the unalterable 'Peace.' Though it has not been recognized, I think this distinction may be observed in Christianity. Jesus was a 'Yati' himself on the 'Nivritti Path.' Much of what He says is applicable to the 'Yati' only. Hence a late Bishop of Peterboro is reputed to have said, that a State founded on the principles of the Sermon on the Mount would not last a fortnight. In other words, you cannot work on the 'Pravritti Path' with the Principles of the Sadhaka on the 'Nivritti Marga.'

On this 'Yati' doctrine, the ages have grafted, a religion for the world, borrowed in part at least from the Pagan world in which Jesus appeared and which continued for centuries after His death. This side is the Religion of Power as opposed to the self-renunciating precepts of Jesus, His want of care for the morrow, His non-resistance to evil, etc. The failure to recognise this in the West has led to great mental confusion. A course of Eastern teaching would clear up all difficulties. The Catholic Church also, which retains more of the ancient wisdom and practices than any other of the Christian communities, recognises the distinction in Christ's teaching of what it calls "counsels of perfection" and of that which is for all. In practice, also it distinguishes between the life of an ascetic and that of a man of the world. In 'Pravritti Dharma' one seeks union with the 'Saguna Atma' and as 'Dharma' is a part or principle of it 'Dharma' is followed. But this is quite different from that of those who are leaving the world. On the 'Pravritti

Path' we are power and develop power; on the other path, power in the worldly sense is avoided that rest and peace may be had. But one must be firmly in one path or the other and not wobble or think one-self to be on the "superior" path of renunciation when one is properly on the path of desire. In India, there is a good deal of false asceticism and pretended 'Vairagya' which is nothing but the tired feeling of the surface consciousness. We can all exprience the sort of 'Vairagya' which comes from earning less than we want or not getting the sought-for Duputy Magistracy. A good deal of religious "renunciation" is mere slackness, the tired feeling of an organism which neither truly reacts to life nor is yet strong and sincere enough to truly negate it. There is a lot of superficial knowledge of 'Vedanta etc.' People learn that the 'Karmakanda' is 'lower' and as every one considers himself "superior", he talks 'Vedantic Vairagya' with his desire firmly rooted in the world. One must do away with all this. Unless a man is by nature truly a 'Yati' who has

forsaken the world, let him be truly of it and develop all his powers therein according to his 'Dharma,' whatever be the form of faith to which he adheres. This applies to all whether Hindu, Mahomedan or Christian. This is the Religion of Power which India needs if She is to be Herself again. But this is a wholly different idea from that of the Westernizing Hindu who thinks that all Sannyasis are frauds, that religion is the bane of India etc. It is really an issue of 'Adhikara' which is raised in which both sides are recognised, but competency is insisted on. The 'Shakta Tantra' has developed some forms of extremist "Sadhana" which are dangerous and have led to abuse, but it contains principles of great value on the question here discussed.

ENGLISH EDUCATION, PATRIOTISM, FREE THINKING.

At the tenth annual meeting of Ram Mohan Roy Library the Hon'ble Mr. Justice Woodroffe delivered the following speech as President.

In the first place I congratulate the Library on the progress made as shown in the report of the Secretary just read to you and I thank you for the honour which you have done me in asking me to preside this evening and Dr. Seal for his kind words in proposing me to the chair. I will add a few words to those of the speakers who have preceded me as my tribute to the memory of Ram Mohan Roy. I read a Stotra lately which was prettily called a "Handful of flowers of flattery." My few words are not that: for though the Raja

was a great man there is no true honour where there is exaggeration. Of his own personal religious beliefs, to which Dr. Seal has referred I will not speak. No one seems to know exactly what they were. Perhaps the Raja never finally determined them for himself in detail since his opinions seem to have shifted up to the day of his death. He presented different aspects to different people. According to his Eastern aspect he appears as a man who cited the Vedanta, did Purashcharana and other Tantrik rituals and had as his Guru Swami Hariharananda Bharati, the follower of what the Raja himself called the "authentic and well accepted Agama Shastras." Other biographers speak unattractively of his faith as the vague theism of a religious Benthamite. He was like a piece of shot silk which shows a different colour according to its position and the light. He was claimed in fact as an adherent by people of varying beliefs. There are always to be found persons who will claim you as one of their party because you have the intelligence to understand

their doctrine and the honesty to fairly represent it; such is the rarity to this class of persons of both qualities in this world. If I may hazard my own estimate he was under some western trappings a Hindu who wished his countrymen to accept in Hinduism what he thought to be its best. Whether his opinions in this matter were always right or not is another and controversial question into which I will not here enter. Whatever he may have been, he was a learner to the end ; a 'Sadhaka, and not a 'Siddha' such as your great Ramakrishna Paramahangsa.

One can speak with more certainty of what he did. For he was I think (though Babu Hirendra Nath Dutt has in his speech taken a different view) greater as a Patriot and Social Worker than as a theologian or philosopher.

A great deal has been said of him as the first prominent Indian to father English education which, like every thing else in this world, has borne a mingled fruit of good with what is not so. The Devil, it is said, takes toll of all good enterprises. I

like however to think of him as a man who desired that his country should assimilate foreign culture with its own being, transforming what is without *into itself*, rather than as like a young Bengali I met last year, who was so oppressed at the notion of the inability of his race to stand by itself that he told me he wanted to see it absorbed in some other. Personally I should prefer not to be eaten up by any one. Probably the Râja would have said to us (if not, let us say it for him) "take all that is good and suitable to yourself." I do not understand him to have said that the people of this country were to cover themselves in the second-hand spiritual, intellectual, and moral clothes of others. To each his own, and let there be room for all in this wonderfully beautiful world.

The Râja was also perhaps the first of Indian Patriots in the modern sense of the term. But here again we must qualify. Patriotism in that sense was as unknown in ancient days as 'constitutional agitation' of which the Râja is said to have been the father. The spiritual Indian of the

ancient type suppressed his own individual egoism. National egoism was also unknown to him. He may have esteemed it good fortune to have been born in Shrî Bhârata, and would have served the land of his birth in the detached spirit of a true 'Karma Yogî; but believing as he did in the Universal Âtmâ and in reincarnation which might make him in other births a member of another race, he could not, as the Western and his Eastern disciples do, identify himself passionately with what is but one of his numerous transitory manifestations. The Râja in this as in other matters stands to some extent midway between Past and Present. For he was a rejoicer in the good fortune of all nations, and was free from selfish and vaunting pride in his own race. His mastering idea was to secure the general good and happiness of his people and as a part of it the political advantages and social comforts of the West.

Like many a courageous man, the Râja was full of tenderness for the poor, the weak and the oppressed. Most notable

here was his noble championship of the cause of woman, and the protection he, in particular, secured for her against the hideous cruelty of the practice of 'Sati.' This feeling for and support of woman is to me worth more than anything else he said or did.

In one of his letters he tells us that it was with this same objective of political advantage and social comfort that he entered upon his religious reform. Pragmatic tests and considerations are not without their value, but for religion they are not the only ones. The manner however in which religious reform may work is illustrated by the following story :—

There was a holy man who was yet human enough to keep a cat as his pet. The animal being very fond of his master used after the manner of his kind to come up and rub himself against him. To prevent the cat distracting him, the Sâdhu used to tie it up during his meditation and worship. The Sâdhu's disciples, in the imitative manner of their kind, continued to tie up the cat during worship though it

showed no disposition to distract *them*. The disciples of the latter however gave up all worship, but nevertheless continued *to tie up the cat.*

Well, Râm Mohan Roy thought there was in his day too much " tying up of the cat." So far as there has been any unnecessary " tying up of the cat ", no one will object to the Râja's release of that animal. But the question which nevertheless arises here, as in other cases, is whether a belief or practice which has given occasion to abuse should be retained free of that abuse or altogether abolished. It is on this question of course that the orthodox will think that the Râja went too far.

I am not going to discuss this question here though it is full of interest. As however the old system claimed to make provision for all types, I should like to cite at this point an amusing Taoist allegory taken from the Chinese Chwangtze, which illustrates the danger of attempting to make everyone alike. It runs as follows :—

The Ruler of the Southern Ocean was Shu, the Ruler of the Northern Ocean was Hu, and the ruler of the Centre was Chaos. Shu and Hu were continually meeting in the land of Chaos, who treated them very well. They consulted together how they might repay his kindness, and said "Men all have seven orifices for the purposes of seeing, hearing, eating, and breathing, while this ruler alone has not one. Let us try and make them for him." Accordingly they dug one orifice in him every day: and at the end of seven days Chaos died. Poor Chaos! If he had been left in his chaotic, undetermined, undifferentiated, and, therefore, necessarily inactive ("wu wei") condition, which was indeed the "raison d'être" of his existence, he could have enjoyed a life of eternity; and of perfect contentedness too. The unnecessary, though quite well-meant, interference of his neighbours permanently put an end to his very existence. This allegory may preach only one part of truth, but it is one not to be neglected. The truly synthetic type of mind is a reflection of the totality

of Nature herself, and as the latter finds a place for all which exists, so does he. For though his wisdom may induce him to encourage particular types and to set straight others, he will be at least careful how he deals with the latter, being well aware that nothing survives which is without its justification. Are we then, it may be asked to have no reform? And I may here refer to Dr. Prabhu Dutt Shâstrî's speech. The question is answered when it is asked, for whilst it is being asked at every *lava* of time each atom of the universal mass is being reformed. The story is a caution against unwise individual meddling with the natural or cosmic order of things. Nature's reformations are without error.

There are points in the Râja's character which we can all admire whatever be the opinions which we may individually hold on any of the questions to which I have referred. It is here not so important whether the Râja was always right or wrong. The noteworthy fact is that he was one of those who did something and

did it with a great heart, when most of us are and do nothing at all. Foremost among his characteristics were his courage, sincerity, tenderness, and love of freedom. He thought for himself and judged for himself. If anything was of authority it was because he accepted it as such. And he would allow no infringement upon this personal freedom. This characteristic he shared with the great men of old, for it is little realised how much free thinking existed in Ancient India. By thinking one is a Muni, "Mananât muniruchyate." No one in fact was then a 'Muni' who did not freely think and form an opinion of his own. It may be that, as a result of such thinking, the opinion or creed of another is accepted, but in such case it is freely chosen and not imposed from without. This ancient free-thinking was generally of a kind which supplied its own corrective against the excesses of mere individualism. For it was a corporate thinking, or more strictly speaking, thinking on corporate lines. The Râja's individualism was therefore not a mere assertion of his own

'Ahangkâra,' a performance for which many of us are entirely competent, but an expression of that self-respect which every man who is a man owes to himself, and which he himself again owes to the society of which he is a part. No Indian in recent times has realised more clearly than the Râja the maxim "Paropakâro hi paramo dharma," And it is for this we all honour him.

INDIAN MANNERS

[*The following is a Reply to a correspondent written on 29th January, 1918.*]

Owing to pressure of work I have unavoidably been delayed in answering your letter. I have no desire to enter this controversy, but as you request my opinion I will give it.

I do not myself, nor does any other Englishman, Irishman or Scotchman, feel inclined to imitate anyone. We therefore do not generally borrow Indian customs or manners, for we consider ours are good and the best for us. Nor do we, as a rule esteem the imitator, for the latter is generally a snob or a person who, to the extent and in respect of the subject of imitation, writes himself down as inferior to ourselves. Many Indians however desire to imitate us, a fact which gives many of

us a good conceit of ourselves. Personally if I were a native of this country I would not adopt any foreign custom unless I was satisfied that I ought to do so. Certainly I would not give up the Indian salutation for an English handshake, great and inspired by freedom and comradeship though the shaking of hands be. I should see no object in doing so except to imitate, and thereby acknowledge the superiority (in this particular respect at least) of a foreign civilization. As regards however your outlook upon women, it is not ours. We do not feel in the way you describe, either when shaking the hand of another man's wife, or seeing another man shake the hand of our own wife. As a foreigner however I would respect the feelings of the people of this country in all matters, and would not shake hands with anyone (man or woman) who, or whose people, I thought might not like me to do so.

Yours truly,
JOHN G. WOODROFFE.

UNIVERSITY EDUCATION

[*Note in reply to questions issued by the University Commission. 1917-18.*]

Not being an educational expert I will not attempt to deal with the technical details involved in the questions submitted to me. I wish only to say a few words on a radical matter, namely the general attitude we should adopt as regards Indian Education. We cannot separate the question of University Education from that of Education in general. The undergraduate has already been made or spoiled in the family, school, or college. Nor, if we pursue the subject to the end, can we avoid an enquiry into political, religious, and cultural questions in general. The fundamental fact is that a government alien in race, habits, thoughts, feelings, religion and general culture controls the education

(more and more strictly in recent years) and essays to teach the people of this country. It has been well said that probably in the whole world there are not two more dissimilar persons than an Englishman and a Hindu. The position is unnatural, and injurious to the true interests of this country. This control may be, and I think has been, directed by self-regarding political motives. But even if the point of view be one which primarily regards the interests of the Indian people, there is still place for conflicting theories and practice. There are some (the foremost of whom may be called Missionaries of Race) who, sincerely believing in the superiority of Western Civilization, think that it will be for the benefit of India to impose it on the East. The product of this system is Macaulay's "Coloured Englishman." The drift of Education has been in this direction. As my friend Mr. Havell (formerly Principal of the Calcutta School of Art) has rightly said, the fault of the Anglo-Indian Educational System is that, instead of harmonizing with, and supplementing,

national culture, it is antagonistic to, and destructive, of it. Sir George Birdwood says of the system that it "has destroyed in Indians the love of their own literature, the quickening soul of a people, and their delight in their own arts, and worst of all their repose in their own traditional and national religion, has disgusted them with their own homes, their parents, and their sisters, their very wives, and brought discontent into every family so far as its baneful influences have reached."

Since writing the above I have read a speech recently addressed by Sir Subrahmania Aiyar to the law students at Madras, in which, pointing out that it seems to be thought that the aim and end of British tutelage in India is to westernise its children, he says that the fulfilment of the aim must in the very nature of things tend to sap all true life and initiative natural to the people as a distinctly Eastern race destined to evolve on lines of its own. He also refers to a recent issue of the Journal "The Statist," to the effect that the object of the present rule seems

intended to metamorphose the Indian into "a quasi-English breed." Such a breed I may add is likely to lead to half-thinking, inefficient action, and worse.

As nothing is wholly evil, I personally believe that some benefits have been gained through the Education given, but looking upon the matter as a whole, I concur in thinking that this Education has had baneful effects. What else can be expected from a position so unnatural ? Wrong Education is the cause of physical and mental strain and the sapping of moral strength. It is productive of instability leading in the case of some to violence, in the case of others to a paralyzing inner conflict, or a sense of intolerable oppression, and in a large number of ordinary and inferior natures to imitation, automatisms, and subservience. The influences working on the student have been deracializing (if I may use the word to denote destruction of racial characteristics) devitalizing, and deforming.

If they have not worked their full evil it is due to the resistance of the racial spirit

defending itself against the assaults, increasing in number and strength, made upon it in recent years.

Personally I should like to see the education of the Indian people in the hands of Indians themselves without any interference from Government as at present constituted. But if Government must control Education, the principle on which it now proceeds should be changed.

Let us recognise the strength, persistence, and value of the racial characteristics of the Indian people, who have survived in a way, and to a degree, which is not seen in the case of any other country in the world. It is not necessary to enquire into the question of the respective superiority of the civilizations of East and West. It is sufficient to hold that Indian civilization is the best for the people whose forefathers have evolved it. Let us stop all attempts, direct or indirect whether political or religious, to impose our beliefs and practices on a people to whom they are foreign. Let us admit and give effect to the claim of the true Indian patriot that

his language, history, literature, art, philosophy, religion, general culture and ideals should be given the primary place in the prescribed courses of study.

If education be to educe, what can be educed from the Indian mind and character but inherited racial impressions? Is it Education to neglect or suppress these and to cram it with foreign stuff? This observation does not exclude any form of knowledge, western or otherwise. Knowledge is knowledge whether it comes from East or West. An Indian student is none the less true to his type because his own cultural inheritance has been enriched by what of worth the West can give. It is directed to the positive cultivation of Indian culture, and in other matters the adoption of an attitude favourable to it. The 17th question asks whether the conditions under which students live undermine traditional morality. "Conditions" (if I understand the question rightly) indicates that the question has in view only some superficial features of the student's life. Where morality (I use the term in its general

sense,) has been undermined it is due in primary degree to the alleged "neutrality" of the State as regards religion, its teaching which ignores religion, the past attacks on the Indian religion, Hindu and Mussalman, westernizing influences and the general atmosphere produced by these and other causes.

How can traditional morality be preserved when the whole course of education is to ignore it and thus leave it the easier prey of sectarian attack and secular scepticism? How can the Indian student present an effective attitude to life if the source of his vitality is neglected or suppressed and his movements are cramped by foreign vestures? It is true that an increasing national consciousness has been to some extent remedying the evils of an English education on English principles by English teachers, but the necessity to remove the causes of these evils still remains.

It follows from the above views that, in my opinion, education should be such as a true and not as a denationalised Indian

would desire to see given and would himself, if an educator, give. Such an education can only be properly given by an Indian, able in his subject and inspired by great ideals, who has not been denationalised under the English system of education which has hitherto prevailed. The class here excepted may be less competent to teach than the English original of which they are a copy. All intriguers for posts of teachers and professors should be rigorously suppressed. As a result of this it follows that distinctions in the educational service should be abolished and Indians should be employed in every case except those in which the expert knowledge of a European (and not necessarily an Englishman) justifies his appointment. The educational curriculum should give Indian culture and the Indian standpoint the primary place. Art should be recognised, and not as it is now ignored, by the University. India being an agricultural country there should be courses for agricultural professorships and travelling agricultural lectureships. (Q. 13). Law is at present too much encou-

raged. All the public opinion with which I am acquainted is against the further multiplication of lawyers. Teaching should be in the vernacular as much as possible. Students are greatly strained by having to learn in a foreign tongue. The university should be as free of government interference and have as much independence of action as is possible. There should certianly be a large degree of freedom of teaching and study. In short I would claim for the university every freedom to follow those ideals which the past history of India, and past and present Indian culture, present to it.

INDIAN ISLAMIC CULTURE

[*At the Annual Meeting of the Calcutta Madrassa, Sir John Woodroffe as President spoke as follows.*]

The Madrassa made provision for both eastern and western learning both of which are under present circumstances necessary.

The former was their Islamic culture which it was hardly necessary to urge them to preserve. On the contrary the reproach sometimes made against their community was its too great conservatism. If he made some remarks to that effect it was because he was going to press upon them the need of qualifying themselves for the life of to-day, and he did not wish to be supposed that he failed to recognise the necessity of adhering to what was of worth in their ancient tradition. All were benefitted by the adherence of each to his own particular type.

Each form of culture whether Moslem, Hindu or English must perfect itself, and the world would be richer thereby. Others would benefit besides those who belonged to the type to be improved. The same ideals may in substance be expressed in the forms of differing creeds and races. These however as forms were apt to conflict.

Each person, whether consciously or unconsciously, was according to the degree of his vitality affecting others. As Moslems, however, it was their duty to withstand any influences which imperil what was worthy to be preserved in their tradition. If it was not worthy they might be sure that in the end it would be destroyed at the hands of others. Each, however, has meantime to play his own part.

Counsel to adhere to one's own, has some fashion nowadays, though it was not always so. But all those who give such advice do not do so with motives, or in a manner, which serve their true interests. If we let a sleeper sleep beyond his time he will certainly do nothing which will annoy us.

But this is not in the true interests of the sleeper himself. Young Moslems should awake, spring to meet Life and meet the demands She makes on them. Emphasis must therefore also be laid on the necessity of a progressive modification of their life suitable to the needs of the day. They should therefore prosecute with zeal their western studies. How could they compete with the rest of the world unless they knew their ways ? How could they hold their own unless they also took into their hands the instruments of success which are in the possession of others ? They should thus build on the foundations of their ancient life raising such a structure thereon as is suitable to the time. He understood that the two departments of the Madrassa are designed to effect this result. At no period has such counsel been more urgent than to-day. Neither they nor anyone else can otherwise keep their head above the angry waters of the present and coming world. For this, science and industry are necessary, and a good knowledge of English which in

time will be one of the most universally spread languages in the world. He understood there were now no commerce classes, which he regretted. In this way they would advance their country India: for though by religious belief Moslems, they were nevertheless, Indians. There were Arabic, Turkish, Egyptian, Chinese, Mohammedans and so forth. An Indian Moslem however, is one who sharing in the general culture of India has distinct characteristics which mark him out from his brothers of other races. Whilst each individual and community has its own particular interests to serve, they and other Indian communities have certain common interests. They should unite as regards these in all friendliness. A house divided against itself will not stand. These are the three things which he wished to say that day, concluding with the hope that the Madrassa might continue to do successful work in the coming teaching year.

THE CALCUTTA ANGLO-GUJARATI SCHOOL

(Extracts from the speech delivered as President of the 24th Annual Prize Distribution of the Calcutta Anglo-Gujarati School.)

Lady Woodroffe and I are pleased to be with you to-day and thank you for the honour which you have done us in asking us to preside at your annual gathering.

Speaking for myself I am the greater pleased in that your school is the expression of certain principles which I hold to.

In the first place I see from the history of the school that it is the outcome of private endeavour and not of begging from Government. All honour and reward are due to private effort. It alone secures independence. Those who beg from Government must put their heads under its yoke. Moreover self-support is a sign of true life and strength.

Secondly the school is the expression of Indian patriotism and of Gujarati patriotism in particular. It speaks to the strength of the feeling which binds you as Gujaratis. You are holding together amongst yourselves and as against the outside world. Being Gujaratis you think it right to perpetuate your type and tradition. You do not (like some Indians) unnecessarily barter your racial inheritance for an education at Government and missionary schools.

Thirdly you are holding together without sectional dispute. For I am told that your school provides for the education of Hindus, Mahommedans and Parsis alike. You thus remember that whatever be your religious faith you Gujaratis are willing to work with all your brethren.

Lastly you not only provide an education for boys but for girls, with what success is shown by the number of the latter on the school roll which is more than half that of the boys, whilst the attendance and examination result is greater in case of the girls than the boys.

I am glad to note from the figures put before me that your financial position is both sound and strong so that a continued and prosperous existence is not in doubt.

We both wish you much prosperity in the coming year.

THE EDUCATION OF WOMEN

[*Sir John Woodroffe who presided at The Mahakali Patashala Prize Day spoke as follows*].

I am glad by my presence here to be able to do a *Kumari Puja* of my own. Your institution founded by a great and revered woman educates little Hindu girls on orthodox Indian lines. This is its good point. I am not now referring to the merits of Hindu orthodoxy or as to what you teach. I do not here discuss that: but I have in mind the principles which you rightly uphold that members of a faith should bring up, and have the opportunity of bringing up, their children in the schools of their faith. If a man thinks it worth while being a Hiudu, why should he send his children to be educated by those who in any case disbelieve in, where they are not actively opposed to his religion ? Not to speak of hybrid culture, no religious

good, either in a Hindu or Christian sense, is likely to come of such a course. If by the sending of Hindu children to, say, Christian schools they were to become good Christians, nothing could be said against it from a Christian standpoint, though of course I understand that you would naturally not assent. But such a course is not likely to produce this result, but only to unsettle the girl's mind, so that she becomes neither Christian nor Hindu. If a man values a faith and culture let him value it for his children. You here do. Therefore you have this school. I suppose the class of which I speak do not, and will suffer in the way all half-and-half people in this world do. It is greatly to your credit that you give education free. I want however to point out that unless you recast some common ideas and practices concerning women, you can neither give a true education nor keep your community alive. Look at what happens among you. Your girls leave you whilst mere children, to be married. It goes without saying that no sufficient education, and such as

will build up the future womanhood of India, can be thus given. This results from insistence on too early marriage. Your report seems to me to seek to palliate the matter by saying that the mother is the realization of true womanhood. In a sense this is true. It is however a crudely animal, but common, view of some to read this as meaning that women are only Yantras or machines for the bearing of children. Moreover, of what use is it to be a mother if she, a mere child, suffers physically thereby; if her mind be ignorant and stunted so that she is no real companion to her husband or teacher of her children? How can a wife of this type be a true *Sahadharmini*? How can she uphold your race? These and other customs injuriously affecting women must be done away with if you would survive.

There are a class of people who think that "Hinduism" (meaning thereby every thing which so calls itself) is immobile. Such neither know history nor their own Shastras. It is true that there is a *Sanatana Dharma*. But, if every rule

and custom which exists is unchangeable, pray, what is the meaning of *Desha*, *Kala*, *Patra*, of *Yugadharma*, of *Lokachara* and other similar terms? They all imply this that we must take into account time, place and circumstance. We must all move on and with the vital current of our age or we shall be left stranded high and dry on the banks to wither and die. Remember that all civilisations work on woman as on one of their main pivots. They are the source whither men and women spring. Honour woman. Remove all customs which stand in the way of her true freedom and advancement. If you do not, your race will pass away by the will of that great *Shakti* whose earthly representatives (*Vigraha*) according to your Scriptures all women are. One need not however believe in Shakti, but need only have common-sense to know the reason why. As that great American Walt Whitman said, "Unfolded only out of the superbest woman of the earth is to come the superbest man of the earth. Unfolded out of the justice of the woman all justice is unfolded." In an

old *Shakta* hymn it is said—*Striyah devah, Striyah pranah* "Women are Devas, women are life itself." Mark the words "life itself", for all that I might say to you is concisely stated there. If you will not give your education (which should be on Indian lines), others than yourselves will give theirs. I would ask you one and all to do what you can to defer the year of marriage and so extend the years of education, and to make that education real. There is much to be done, which is not being done and cannot under present conditions of your society be done. But for what you are doing and of those who approve your view-point and practice I can join with you in asking for that support which, as your report shows, you stand in such urgent need. I hope you will get it. May the work which your founder commenced not fail. May it be the seed of something greater to come.

VEDANTA AND TANTRA SHASTRA

[*Speech at a Meeting held on the Anniversary of Swami Vivekananda on 28th January, 1917.*]

When your representative asked me to speak this evening he suggested to me as my subject that Shastra which is a practical application of the Vedantic teaching. Mere talk about Vedanta is nothing but a high form of amusement. If more than this is to be achieved, definite Sadhana is necessary. In the grand opening chapter of the Kularnava Tantra it is said :—" In this world are countless masses of beings suffering all manner of pain. Old age is waiting like a tigress. Life ebbs away as it were water from out a broken pot. Disease kills like enemies. Prosperity is but a dream ; youth is like a flower. Life is seen and is gone like lightning. The body is but a bubble of water. How then can one know this and yet remain content ?

The Jîvâtma passes through lakhs of existences, yet only as man can he obtain the truth. It is with great difficulty that one is born as man. Therefore is he a self-killer who, having obtained such excellent birth, does not know what is for his good. Some there be who, having drunk the wine of delusion, are lost in worldly pursuits, who reck not the flight of time and are moved not at the sight of suffering. There are others who have tumbled in the deep well of the Six Philosophies—idle disputants tossed on the bewildering ocean of the Vedas and Shâstras. They study day and night and learn words. Some again, overpowered by conceit, talk of *Unmanî* though not in any way realising it. Mere words and talk cannot dispel the delusion of the wandering. Darkness is not dispelled by the mention of the word 'lamp'. What then is there to do? The Shâstras are many, life is short and there are a million obstacles. Therefore should their essence be mastered just as the Hangsa separates the milk from the water with which it has been mixed."

It then says that knowledge alone can gain liberation. But what is this knowledge, and how may it be got? Knowledge in the Shâstric sense is actual immediate experience (Sakshatkara), not the mere reading about it in books however divine, and however useful as a preliminary such study may be.

How then can we gain it? The answer is, by Sâdhana—a term which comes from the root "to exert." It is necessary to exert oneself according to certain disciplines which the various religions of the world provide for their adherents. Much shallow talk takes place on the subject of ritual. It is quite true that some overlook the fact that it is merely a means to an end. But it is a necessary means all the same. This end cannot be achieved by merely sitting in Padmâsana and attempting to meditate on the Nirguna Brahman. One may as well try to seize the air with a pair of tongs. How then may the Vedântic truth be realised? The Indian Shâstra purports to give the means for the Indian body and mind. What Shâstra? Not the

Karmakânda of the Vedas, because with the exception of a few hardly surviving rites, such as Homa, it has passed away. The actual discipline you will find in the Âgamas.

I prefer the use of this term to that of "the Tantra," now so common, but which has risen from a misconception and leads to others. Tantra means injunction (Vidhi), or regulation (Niyama), or treatise, *i.e.*, simply Shâstra. Thus Shangkara calls the Sângkhya "Tantra." One cannot speak of "the Tantra" any more than one can speak of "the treatise." We do not speak of the Purâna, the Samhitâ, but of the Purânas and Samhitâs. Why then speak of "the Tantra"? One can speak of the Tantras or Tantra Shâstra. The fact is that there is an Agama of several schools, Shaiva, Shakta and Vaishnava. Shiva and Shakti are one. The Shaiva (in the narrower sense) predominantly worships the right side of the Ardhanârîshvara Murti, the Shâkta worships the left (Vâma or Shakti) side: the place of woman-being on the left. The Vaishnava Âgama is the famous

Pâncharâtra, though there are Tantras not of this school in which Vishnu is the Ishtadevatâ. All Âgamas of whatever group share certain common ideas, outlook and practice. There are also certain differences. Thus the Northern Shaivâgama which is called Trika (and not "the Tantra") is, as is also the Shâkta Tantra, Advaita. The Southern Shaiva school which is called Shaiva Siddhânta (and not "the Tantra") as also the Vaishnava Âgama or Pâncharâtra (and not "the Tantra") are Vishishtâdvaita. There is some variance in ritual also, as follows from variance in the Ishtadevatâ worshipped. Thus, as is well known, it is only in some forms of worship that there is animal sacrifice; and in one division again of worshippers there are rites which have led to those abuses which have gained for "the Tantra" its ill fame. A person who eats meat can never, it is said, attain Siddhi in the Shiva Mantra according to Dakshinopâsana. Each one of these schools has its own Tantras, of which there were at one time probably thousands. The Shaiva

Siddhânta speaks of 28 chief Tantras or Âgamas with many Upatantras. In Bengal mention is made of 64. There are numerous Tantras of the Northern Shaiva school of which the Mâlinîvijaya and Svachchhanda Tantras are leading examples. The original connection between the Shaiva schools of North and South is shown by the fact that there are some books which are common to both, such as the Matanga and Mrigendra Tantras. The Pâncharâtra is composed of many Tantras such as Lakshmî and Padma Tantras and other works called Samhitâs. In the Commentary to the Brahma Samhitâ, which has been called the "essence of Vaishnavism," you will find Jiva Goswami constantly referring to Gautamiya Tantra. How then has it come about that there is the ignorant notion that (to use the words of an English work on Tibetan Buddhism) "Tantra is restricted to the necromantic books of the later Sivaic or Shakti mysticism." I can only explain this by the fact that those who so speak had no knowledge of the Tantras as a whole and were possibly to

some extent misled by the Bengali use of the term the "Tantra," to denote the Shâkta Tantras current in Bengal. Naturally the Bengalis spoke of their Tantras as "the Tantra," but it does not follow that this expression truly represents the fact. I might develop this point at great length but cannot do so here. I wish merely to correct a common notion.

Well, it is in these Tantras or the Âgamas that you will find the ritual and Sâdhana which governs the orthodox life of the day as also in some of the Purânas which contain much Tantrik ritual.

I am not concerned to discuss the merits or the reverse of these various forms of Sâdhana. But the Âgama teaches an important lesson, the value of which all must admit, namely:—mere talk about Religion and its truths will achieve nothing spiritual. There must be action (Kriyâ). Definite means must be adopted if the truth is to be realised. The Vedânta is not spoken of as a mere speculation as Westerrn Orientalists describe it to be. It claims to be based on experience. The Âgamas say

that if you follow their direction you will gain Siddhi. As a Tibetan Buddhist once explained to me, the Tantras were regarded by his people rather as a scientific discovery than as a revelation; that is, something discovered by the self rather than imparted from without. They claim to be the revealed means by which the Tattva or other matters may be discovered. But the point is, whether you follow these directions or not, you must follow some. For this reason every ancient faith has its ritual. It is only in modern times that persons with but little understanding of the subject have thought ritual to be unnecessary. Their condemnation of it is based on the undoubted abuses of mechanical and unintelligent devotion. But because a thing is abused, it does not follow that it is itself bad.

The Âgama is, as a friend of mine well put it, a practical philosophy, adding, What the intellectual world wants most to-day is this sort of philosophy—a philosophy which not merely *argues* but *experiments*. He rightly points out that the latest tendency

in modern Western philosophy is to rest upon intuition as it was formerly the tendency to glorify dialectics. But as to the latter "Tarkâpratishthânât." Intuition however has to be led into higher and higher possibilities by means of Sâdhana, which is merely the gradual unfolding of the Spirit's vast latent magazine of power, enjoyment, and vision which every one possesses in himself. All that exists is *here*. There is no need to throw one's eyes into the heavens for it. The Vishvasâra Tantra says "What is here is there: what is not here is nowhere." As I have said, I am not here concerned with the truth or expediency of any particular religion or method (a question which each must decide for himself), but to point out that the principle is fully sound, namely, that Religion is and is based on spiritual experience, and if you wish to gain such experience it is not enough to talk about or have a vague wish for it, but you must adopt some definite means well calculated to produce it. The claim of the Âgama is that it provides such means and is thus a

practical application of the teaching of the Vedânta. The watchword of every Tântrik is Kriyâ—to be up and doing. You will find in the useful compilation called Yatidharmanirnaya that even Dandins of Shangkara's school follow a Tantrik ritual suited to their state. In fact all must act who have not achieved.

This leads me to say a word on the Swâmi in whose honour we meet to-day. He was always up and doing. The qualities I most admire in him are his activity, manliness and courage. There are still Indians (though fortunately not so numerous as there were when I first came to India, now getting on for 30 years ago) who seem to be ashamed of and would apologize for their life, customs, race, art, philosophy and religion, and so forth. The Swâmi was not of this sort. He was, on the contrary, among the first to affirm his Hindu faith and to issue a bold challenge to all who attacked it. This was the attitude of a man. It is also a manly attitude boldly to reject this faith if after fully studying and understanding it you find that the doct-

rines it preaches do not commend themselves to your reason. For we must at all cost have intellectual, as well as every other form of honesty. But this is another thing from the shame-faced apology of which I speak. which is neither one thing nor another. The Swâmi spoke up and acted. And for this all must honour him who, whatever be their own religious beliefs, value sincerity, truth and courage which are the badge of every nobility. And so I offer these few words to his memory which we all here, either by our speech or presence, honour to-day.

MATTER AND CONSCIOUSNESS

[*Short Summary of an Address delivered at the Dacca Sahitya Parishat, June 1916.*]

The subject of my lecture to-day is Consciousness or Chit, and Matter or Unconsciousness, that is, Achit; the unchanging formlessness and the changing forms. According to Shâkta Advaitavâda we are Consciousness-Unconsciousness or Chit-Achit; being Chit-Shakti as regards our Antarâtma and the particularised Mâyâ Shakti as to our material vehicles of mind and body. The reason why I have selected this subject, amongst the many others on which I might have addressed you, is that these two ideas are the key concepts of Indian Philosophy and religion. If they are fully understood both as to their definition and relations, then all is understood so far as intellect can make such matters intelligible to us; if they are not under-

stood then nothing is properly understood. Nor are they always understood even by those who profess to know and write on Indian Philosophy. Thus the work on Vedânta of an English Orientalist, now in its second edition, describes Chit as the condition of a stone or other inert substance. A more absurd error it is hard to imagine. Those who talk in this way have not learnt the elements of their subject. It is true that you will find in the Shâstra the state of the Yogi described as being like a log (*Kâshta-vat*). But this does not mean that his Consciousness is that of a piece of wood: but that he no more perceives the *external* world than a log of wood does. He does not do so because he has the Samâdhi consciousness that is illumination and true Being itself.

I can to-night only scratch at the surface of a profound subject. To expound it properly it would require a series of lectures, and to understand it in its depths, years of thinking thereon. I will look at the matter first from the scientific point of view;

secondly state what those concepts mean in themselves; and thirdly show how they are related to one another in the Sângkhya and the Mâyâvâda and Shaktivâda presentments of Vedânta doctrine. The Shaktivâda of which I deal to-night may be found in the Tantras. It has been supposed that the Âgamas arose at the close of the age of the Upanishads. They are Shâstras of the Upâsanâ Kânda dealing with the worship of Saguna Îshvara. It has been conjectured that they arose partly because of the declining strength of the Vaidika Âchâra and partly because of the increasing numbers of persons within the Hindu fold who were not competent for the Vaidika Âchâra and for whom some spiritual discipline was necessary. One common feature distinguishes them; namely, their teaching is for all castes and all women. They express the liberal principle that, whilst socially differences may exist, the path of religion is open to all, and that spiritual competency, and not the external signs of caste, determine the position of persons on that path. Îshvara in these

Âgamas is worshipped in three-fold forms as Vishnu, Shiva, Devî. Therefore the Âgamas or Tantras are threefold, Vaishnava, Shaiva and Shâkta, such as the Pancharâtra Âgamas of the first group, the Shaiva Siddhânta (with its 28 Tantras), the Nakulîsha Pâshupata, and the Kashmirian Trika of the second group; and the alleged division into Kaula, Mishra, Samaya of the third group. I express no opinion on this last division. I merely refer to this matter in order to explain what I mean by the word Âgama. The Shaktivâda, however, which I contrast with Mâyâvâda to-day, is taken from the Shâkta Âgama. By Mâyâvâda I mean Shangkara's exposition of Vedânta.

Now, with reference to the scientific aspect of the subject, I show you that in three main particulars modern western physics and psychology support Indian philosophy. Indeed Mr. Lowes Dickinson, in an acute recent analysis of the state of ideas in India, China and Japan, observes that the Indian form of religion and philosophy is that which most easily accommo-

dates itself to modern western science. That does not prove it is true until it is established that the conclusions of western science to which it does conform are true. But the fact is of great importance in countering those who have thought that eastern ideas were without rational foundation. It is of equal importance to those two classes who either believe in the ideas of India, or in the particular conclusions of science to which I refer. The three points on this head are, firstly, that physicists by increasing their knowledge of so-called "matter" have been led to doubt its reality, and have dematerialised the atom and with it the entire universe which the various atoms compose. The trinity of matter, ether and electricity, out of which science has hitherto attempted to construct the world, has been reduced to a single element —the ether (which is not scientific "matter") in a state of motion. According to Sângkhya the objective world is composed of the Bhûtas which derive ultimately from Akâsha. I do not say that scientific "Ether" is Akâsha, which is a concept

belonging to a different line of thought. Moreover the sensible is derived from the supersensible Akâsha Tanmâtra and is not therefore an ultimate. But it is important to note the agreement in this, that both in East and West the various forms of gross matter derive from some single substance which is not "matter." Matter is *dematerialised* and the way is made for the Indian concept of Mâyâ. There is a point at which the mind cannot any longer usefully work outward. Therefore after the Tanmâtra the mind is turned within to discover their cause in that egoism which, reaching forth to the world of enjoyment, produces sensorium, senses, and objects of sensation. That the mind and senses are also quasi-material has the support of some forms of western philosophy such as that of Herbert Spencer, for he holds that the Universe whether physical or psychical is a play of force which in the case of matter we experience as object. Mind as such is, he says, as much a "material" organ as the brain and outer sense-organs though they are differing forms of force. His

affirmation that scientific "matter" is an appearance produced by the play of cosmic force, and that mind itself is a product of the same play, is what Sângkhya and Vedânta hold. The way again is opened for the concept of Mâyâ. Whilst, however, Spencer and the agnostic school hold that the reality behind these phenomena is unknowable, the Vedânta affirms that it is knowable, and is Consciousness itself. This is the Self, than which nothing can be more intimately known. Force is blind. We discover consciousness in the Universe. It is reasonable to suppose that if the first cause is of the nature of either Consciousness, or Matter and not of both, it must be of the nature of the former and not of the latter. Unconsciousness or objectivity may be conceived to modify Consciousness, but not to produce Consciousness out of its unconscious self. According to Indian ideas, Spirit, which is the cause of the Universe, is pure Consciousness. This is Nishkala Shiva: and as the creator the Great Mother or Devi. The existence of pure Consciousness in

the Indian sense has been decried by some thinkers in the West, where generally to its pragmatic eye Consciousness is always particular, having a particular direction and form. It assumes this particularity however through Mâyâ. We must distinguish between Consciousness as such and *modes* in consciousness. Consciousness is the unity behind all *forms* of consciousness whether sensation, emotion, instinct, will or reason. The claim that Consciousness as such exists can only be verified by spiritual experience. All high mystic experiences, whether in East or West, have been experiences of unity in differing forms and degrees. Even, however, in normal life, as well as in abnormal pathological states, we have occasional stretches of experience in which it becomes almost structureless. Secondly, the discovery of the subliminal Consciousness aids Shâstric doctrine in so far as it shows that behind the surface consciousness of which we are ordinarily aware, there is yet another mysterious field in which all its operations grow. It is the Buddhi which here manifests. Well

established occult powers and phenomena now generally accepted, such as telepathy, thought-reading, hypnotism and the like, are only explainable on hypotheses which approach more nearly Eastern doctrine than any other theory which has in modern times prevailed in the West. Thirdly, as bearing on this subject we have now the scientific recognition that from its *materia prima* all forms have evolved; that there is life in all things; and that there are no breaks in nature. There is the same Matter and Consciousness throughout. There is unity of life. There is no such thing as "dead" matter. The well-known experiences of Dr. Jagadish Bose establish response to stimuli in inorganic matter. What is this response but the indication of the existence of that Sattva Guna which Vedânta and Sângkhya affirm to exist in all things organic or inorganic. It is the play of Chit in this Sattva, so muffled in Tamas as not to be recognisable, except by delicate scientific experiment, which appears as the so-called "mechanical" response. Consciousness is here

veiled and imprisoned by Tamas. Inorganic matter displays it in the form of that seed or rudiment of sentiency which, enlarging into the simple pulses of feeling of the lowest degrees of organised life, at length emerges in the developed self-conscious sensations of human life. Consciousness is throughout the same. What varies is its wrappings. There is thus a progressive *release* of Consciousness from gross matter through plants and animals to man. Indian doctrine has taught this evolution in its 84 lakhs of previous births. According to the Hindu books, plants have a dormant consciousness. The Mahâbhârata says that plants can see, and thus they reach the light. Such power of vision would have been ridiculed not long ago, but Professor Haberland, the well-known botanist, has established that plants possess an organ of vision in the shape of a convex lens on the upper surface of the leaf. The animal consciousness is greater, but seems to display itself almost entirely in the satisfaction of animal wants. In man we reach the world of ideas, but these

are a superstructure on Consciousness and not its foundation or basis. It is in this modeless basis that the various modes of Consciousness with which we are familiar in our waking and dreaming states arise.

The question then arises as to the relation of this principle of Form with Formlessness ; the unconscious finite with infinite Consciousness. It is noteworthy that in the Thomistic philosophy, Matter, like Prakriti, is the particularising or *finitising* principle. By their definition, however, they are opposed. How then can the two be one ?

Sângkhya denies that they are one, and says they are two separate independent principles. This Vedânta denies ; for it says that there is, in fact, only one true Reality, though from the empirical dualistic standpoint there seem to be two. If the question then is asked,—is dualism, pluralism, or monism to be accepted ?—for the Vedantist, the answer of Shruti is that it is monism. But apart from this the question is,—does Shruti record a true experience ;

and is it the fact that spiritual experience is monistic or dualistic? The answer is, as we can see from history, that all high mystic experiences are experiences of Unity in differing forms and degrees.

The question cannot be decided solely by discussion but by our conclusion as to the conformity of the particular theory held with spiritual experience. But how can we reconcile the unity of pure Consciousness with the plurality of unconscious forms which the world of experience gives us? Vedânta gives various intellectual interpretations, though experience alone can solve this question. Shangkara says there is only one Sadvastu, the Brahman. From a transcendental standpoint It *is* and nothing happens. There is in the state of highest experience (Paramâtmâ) no Îshvara, no creation, no world, no Jîva, no bondage, no liberation. But empirically he must and does admit the world or Mâyâ, which in its seed is the cosmic Sangskârâ, which is the base of all these notions which, from the highest state, are rejected. But is it real or unreal? Shang-

kara says it is neither. It cannot be real; for then there would be two Reals. It is not unreal; for the world is an empirical fact—an experience of its kind, and it proceeds from the Power of Îshvara. In truth it is unexplainable, and, as Sâyana says, more wonderful than Chit itself.

But if it is neither Sat nor Asat, then as Mâyâ it is not the Brahman who is Sat. Does it then exist in Pralaya, and, if so, how and where? How can unconsciousness exist in pure Consciousness? Shangkara calls it eternal and says that in Pralaya Mâyâsattâ is Brahmasattâ. At that time Mâyâ as the power of the ideating consciousness and the world its thought, do not exist: and only the Brahman is. But if so, how does the next universe arise on the assumption that there is Pralaya and that there is not with Him as Mâyâ the seed of the future universe? A Bîja of Mâyâ as Sangskâra, even though Avyakta (not present to Consciousness) is yet by its terms different from Consciousness? To all such questionings Shangkara would say they are themselves the product of the

Mâyâ of the state in which they are put. This is true ; but it is possible to put the matter in a simpler way against which there are not so many objections as may be laid against Mâyavâda.

It seems to me that Shangkara who combats Sângkhya is still influenced by its notions, and as a result of his doctrine of Mâyâ he has laid himself open to the charge that his doctrine is not Shuddha Adwaita. His notion of Mâyâ retains a trace of the Sângkhyan notion of separateness, though separateness is in fact denied. In Sângkhya, Mâyâ as Prakriti is the real Creatrix under the illumination of Purusha. We find similar notions in Shangkara, who compares Chit to the Ayaskântamani and denies all liberty of self-determination in the Brahman which, though itself unchanging, is the cause of change. Jnâna Kriyâ is allowed only to Îshvara, a concept which is itself the product of Mâyâ. To some extent the distinctions made are perhaps a matter of words. To some extent particular notions of the Âgamas are more

practical than those of Shangkara who was a transcendentalist.

The Âgama, giving the richest content to the Divine Consciousness, does not deny to it knowledge but in Its supreme aspect any dual knowledge, spiritual experience being likened, by the Brihadâranyaka Upanishad, to the union of man and wife in which duality exists as one and there is neither within nor without. It is this union which is the Divine Lîlâ of Shakti Who is yet all the time one with Her Lord.

The Shâkta exposition appears to be both simple and clear. I can only sketch it roughly—having no time for its detail. It is first the purest Advaitavâda. What then does it say? It starts with the Shruti "Sarvam Khalvidam Brahma." Sarvam = world; Brahman = consciousness or Sachchidânanda; therefore this world is in itself Consciousness.

But we know we are not perfect Consciousness. There is an apparent unconciousness. How then is this explained? The unmanifested Brahman, before all the worlds, is Nirguna Shiva—the Blissful

undual consciousness. This is the static aspect of Shiva. This manifests Shakti, which is the kinetic aspect of Brahman. Shakti and Shaktimân are one; therefore Shiva manifests as Shiva-Shakti Who are one and the same. Therefore Shakti is Consciousness.

But Shakti has two aspects (Mûrtti), *viz.*, Vidyâ-Shakti or Chit-Shakti and Avidyâ-Shakti or Mâyâ Shakti. Both as Shakti, which is the same as Shaktimân, are in themselves conscious. But the difference is that whilst Chit Shakti is illuminating consciousness, Mâyâ is a Shakti which veils Consciousness to itself and by its wondrous power appears as unconscious. This Mâyâ-Shakti is Consciousness which by its power appears as unconsciousness. This Mâyâ-Shakti is Triguna Shakti, that is, Shakti composed of the three Gunâs. This is Kâmakalâ which is the Trigunât-makavibhuti. These Gunâs are therefore, at base, nothing but Chit-Shakti. There is no necessity for the Mâyâvâdin's Chidâbhâsa, that is the reflection of conscious reality on unconscious

unreality as Mâyâvâda says. All is real except in the sense that some things endure and are therefore truly real: others pass and in that sense only are not real. All is Brahman. The Antarâtmâ in man is the enduring Chit-Shakti. His apparently unconscious vehicles of mind and body are Brahman as Mâyâ-Shakti; that is, Consciousness appearing as unconsciousness by virtue of its inscrutable power. Îshvara is thus the name for Brahman as Shakti which is conjoined Chit-Shakti and Mâyâ-Shakti.

The Mother Dêvî is Îshvara considered in His feminine aspect (Îshvarî) as the Mother and Nourisher of the world. The Jîva or individual self is an Angsha or fragment of that great Shakti: the difference being that whilst Ishvara is Mâyâvin or the controller of Mâyâ, Jîva is subject to Mâyâ. The World-thinker retains His supreme undual Consciousness even in creation, but His thought, that is, the forms created by His thinking, are bound by His Mâyâ, that is, the forms with which they identify themselves, until by the power of

the Vidyâ-Shakti in them they are liberated. All is truly Sat—or Brahman. In creation Shiva extends His power and at Pralaya withdraws it into Himself. In creation Mâyâ is in itself Consciousness which appears as Unconsciousness. Before creation it exists as Consciousness.

Important practical results follow from the adoption of this view of looking at the world. The latter is the creation of Îshvara. The world is real; being unreal only in the sense that it is a shifting passing thing, whereas Âtmâ, as the true Reality, endures; for bondage is real, bondage is Avidyâ-shakti, binding consciousness. Liberation is real, for this is the grace of Vidya-shakti. We are each centres of power, and if we would achieve success must, according to this Shâstra, realise ourselves as such, knowing that it is Devatâ which thinks and acts in, and as, us, and that we are the Devatâ. Our world enjoyment is His, and liberation is His peaceful nature. The Âgamas deal with the development of this Power, which is not to be thought of as something

without, but as within our grasp through various forms of Shakti-Sâdhanâ. Being in the world and working through the world, the world itself, in the words of the Kulârnava Tantra, *becomes the seat of liberation* (Mokshâyate Sangsâra). The Vîra or heroic Sâdhaka does not shun the world from fear of it, but holds it in his grasp and wrests from it its secret. Realizing it at length as Consciousness the world of matter ceases to be an object of desire. Escaping from the unconscious driftings of a humanity which has not yet realised itself, He is the illumined master of himself, whether developing all his powers, or seeking liberation at his will.

THE SEED OF RACE

[*The following is a reply (May, 1920) by Sir John Woodroffe to a critical review of his work "The Seed of Race," that appeared in the issue of "Young India" dated 11th February, 1920.*]

I have just received a criticism of my book "The Seed of Race" contained in your issue of the 11th February. Your reviewer approves of my standpoint, but, dealing with my statement that Indian culture should *also* be given a place together with English studies, says that the tone of this and other remarks sound apologetic, which seems unfortunate, and hardly consistent with the note which I submitted to the Calcutta University Commission. It is certainly unfortunate that I used language which has apparently ill expressed what I wanted to say. To correct this

misunderstanding I now write. I am the last person to apologise for Indian culture, the fostering of which I have consistently urged, not as a matter of concession or expediency, but of right—the right of every individual and racial soul fully and freely to express itself in accordance with Svadharma. I have done so also because I believe in its beneficial influence on the world at large.

As your reviewer admirably says, Indian culture is no cripple, and when it borrows from elsewhere it must do so in its fulness and strength, and not out of a sense of its own impotency or deficiency, by which I understand incapacity. Indian culture, should, he says, be at once the basis, superstructure, and crown of the educational edifice. With this general proposition I agree. But what do we mean by fostering Indian culture? Some merely understand thereby the teaching of what has been thought and done in the past, and then its mere *re*-production to-day. I do not. I understand by this phrase primarily the liberation of the general Indian

Sangskâra from all alien incrustation, and then its nourishment, so that it may become in its turn a living cause of cultural forms to-day. These may or may not be the same as the forms of the past, but whatever they be, they are vitally produced as fresh creations and not merely taken over into the present because they have lingered over, often with spent force, from the past. These past cultural forms are the useful and indeed indispensable subject of our study—indispensable because they recall and strengthen the Sangskâra which has produced the Ârya Dharma. We steep ourselves in tradition, not merely to *reproduce* it automatically, but to make ourselves worthy of our forbears, capable of being as vitally *creative* as they were. But since they laid the foundations much has happened. Other cultures have elsewhere grown up and become known to India. Are we not to study these and appropriate from them what is suitable to us? Or are we to build a cultural hothouse, forcing plants which will not live in the rude movements of the airs of Heaven? Certainly not. We

enrich the Sangskâra by every widening of our knowledge; therefore English and other cultures should "also" be studied. As my remarks were addressed to those interested in the furtherance of English studies, I put it in the form that Indian culture must also have its place. Those who have not fallen into the path of error have scarcely need of counsel.

It is in this way that the so-called "universal" as opposed to "regional" culture will (if at all) come about. As each race and man acts according to his own Dharma, that is, according to natural law, he and they perfect their form, for Dharma is the Law of Form. In perfecting our forms we approach to others who have perfected theirs. The highly intellectual, moral, and spiritual are everywhere akin, and this, is as a Russian friend of mine calls it, "the International of Culture." It is not to be obtained by neglect of one's own Dharma and by taking a bit here and a bit there to make up some combination which is neither "fish, flesh, fowl, nor even good red herring." But in practice the

following case arises—the case of those whose intellect, capacity, general development, and opportunities do not permit of this both intensive and extensive culture. Take for instance the ordinary Indian peasant—what of him? If it be the fact that education both in his own and other cultures cannot be given, then, naturally, his own racial culture must be given the first place. Great care must be taken in dealing with the question of primary education in India, for here the mischief may occur. If we sever the people from their past traditions it is difficult to recall them. Whereas if they are preserved they can be added to, or improved later on. All this is becoming increasingly recognized now-a-days, when the people are getting away from what the late Henry James called "a superstitious valuation of Europe." If there is in other parts of the world a "rebarbarization," as Herbert Spencer feared, it may be that in such case the True, the Good, and the Beautiful will be upheld by a cultivated and aristocratic India which, with its roots deep in the past,

bears exemplary flower in the present. Certainly it is necessary, as your reviewer does, to feel all this passionately. Those who think it needful to apologise for their Race and its traditions, have ceased to belong to the former, and to be worthy to carry on the latter. The late George Tyrrell in one of his recently published letters says: "I begin to think the only real sin is suicide *or not being oneself.*" Just so. But if so, we certainly should not apologise for being what we ought to be.

[We are glad Sir John has explained himself as regards his views of the place of Indian culture in the education of Indian youths. We hope he has not misunderstood us. We are not for reproducing old forms without considering whether they are good or bad. Nor do we want a cultural hothouse; what we maintain is, howmuchsoever important a knowledge of English culture may be to the Indians of to-day it need not form the *Sine quo non* of all Indian education. What we would wish is that when the

Indian Educational System is fully developed and organised a study of English and other foreign cultures should form part of a post graduate course. We admit that a knowledge of different cultures will enable us to perfect our own by assimilating the best of the others. Perhaps in the God's world differences will persist, but they must not represent divisions; they must be like facets of one beautiful gem. Has not the Lord said: "Nâstyanto Vistârasya Mê"?—Ed. Y. I.]

IS INDIA CIVILIZED ?

PRESS OPINIONS

"Foreign domination has been much more than mainly political. It is the cultural and social conquest of India which is the really important one, insidious in its cause but permanent in its results. Alien culture threatens to obscure the soul of India, to swamp the Indian culture. Therefore Sir John Woodroffe's latest book is most opportune. His style is simple and convincing. The fundamental principles of Indian culture are examined with great power of insight. Sir John's purpose is to defend the minds of young India against defilement—to create a strong working faith in their own ideals and for this India will be very grateful."—*The Commonweal* (*M.S.M.*).

" Powerful exposition of Indian culture......Many wise political, social and religious observations abound in its inspiring pages. We can commend its perusal to all who are seekers after the truth. If it serves to induce the Europeans to abate some of their racial pride, prejudice and intolerance, and the Indians to have a more correct appreciation of their culture, then it must be regarded as a

most opportune publication at the present moment when the great catastrophe in the West has shaken the faith in the basic principles of Western culture and has given a powerful stimulus to the spirit of introspection and enquiry."—*The Leader*.

" Deep insight into what is of true value in Indian culture—clear with an enthusiasm all the more effective because restrained. It is his conception of India that is the great inspiration in the book. His conception of life is Indian through and through. I have read this book all one afternoon marking page after page its trenchant criticisms of our detractors, its pen pictures of Indian life and culture and especially its illuminating description of what some of our philosophies really mean. It is as if once again as of old, one heard an ancient Guru talking to his disciples. It is a noble book for every Indian home."—*New India* (*C. Jinarajadasa*).

"Sir John has already earned an abiding place in the affections of our countrymen by his intimate and profound studies of Hinduism and his enthusiastic exposition of the basis of Hindu culture. The volume in spite of the ephemeral nature of the incidents of composition has a permanent value and must find a place in the library of every self-respecting Indian."—*Central Hindu College Magazine, the monthly organ of Benares Hindu University.*

"This matter and much more are explained with wonderful lucidity. Sir John points out that the true view of human evolution is the Eastern one

and supports and illustrates his position by reference to, and also using the clearcut and meaningful nomenclature of that system of Hindu Philosophy and Religion of which he is such a master."—*The Hindu (Dr. Subramanya Aiyar).*

"So ably indicates the basic principles of Indian civilization and repudiates the baseless charges with such commendable enthusiasm and righteous indignation as could have befitted one who by birth has inherited the culture—deserves study by every sincere believer in Indian thought. An admirable book—crushing reply—from start to finish shows that the author has a masterly and sympathetic grasp of the whole situation and he who goes through it will find himself in touch with the essentials of Indian civilization."—*Prabuddha Bharata.*

" Sir John Woodroffe has done well to expose the fallacies underlying certain old timeattacks recently reiterated—is deeply imbued with the spirit of Shakta Vedantism, and it is from this point of view that he defends Indian civilization. In a very fine chapter Sir John Woodroffe exhibits the various opinions held about India and her civilization."

—*Servant of India (Professor R. D. Ranade).*

"Contains high intellectual qualities with freedom from prejudice or nonsense of any kind—the best informed work on the subject written by one not a Hindu."—*United India and Native States.*

" The book demands the close attention of every

Indian who is interested in the future of his country. It is an urgent invitation to us to appreciate better both this sacred trust and the near peril which besets it, and to stand firm and faithful in the hour of ordeal. The author develops his theory with great skill and much quiet depth and the essays are strewn throughout with acute and penetrating observations expressed with a lucid solidity which tempts one constantly to quotation." —*Arya*.

"Is throughout thought-provoking and replete with interesting passages. But those on whom Sir John's eulogisms will drop like manna from Heaven should also ponder on what (else) he has to say. It would be well for India if instead of cultivating a blind racial vanity, for which Sir John's book will furnish ample material to the unthinking bigot, we concentrate our attention on those other lessons preached by him, for only by so doing we would make a right use of the truths it contains." —*Modern Review*.

"This noble work is a trumpet call to the Indians to realise their greatness and distinctiveness and to build the great future of India—a loving and intimate student of a great culture."—*Hindu Message*.

"India owes a deep debt of gratitude to Sir John Woodroffe for this timely volume in defence of Indian culture—certain social aspects have been so satisfactorily discussed and defended by this erudite defender of our civilization that if the Indian social

reformer would care to read and think over them, much of his rancour towards orthodoxy will prove baseless. India's greatest civilization is misunderstood by many intellectual imps both foreign and indigenous. It is a consolation to find that great minds Indian or foreign can realise it so well as in the case of Sir John's. Knowledge of the inner capability of the Ego teaches but one kind of patriotism which is of course universal and not national. It is as silly to hug the degenerates of our own nationality as to hate the great souls of the other continents. But to stand for their rights when oppressed is the privilege of every right thinking man and words fail us in thanking Sir John for his humane duty; may they be ever more."—*Mahratta.*

"Sir John writes profoundly of the Hindu religion and culture of which he is an ardent admirer and his defence of Indian civilization is informed with a glowing enthusiasm. He finds it easy to confound the rationalist Mr. Archer. The book will not please every Christian that reads it. But no occidental student of Indian politics should miss the reading, for it explains much in the Hindu character and point of view that before was obscure and incomprehensible. The Author believes that the ancient Hindu culture which has perished throughout the ages, is the best for India and he is fearful lest it be lost in the political maelstrom which will follow the war."—*Capital.*

Great erudition—sturdy champion of Sanâtana Dharma.—*Indian Daily News.*

" Most effective and crushing rejoinder—the work of a distinguished scholar and deep thinker—truly merits a very wide circulation in this country. It is a profoundly philosophic study of the subject." —*Hindusthan Review.*

" The constitution of a politically dependent people can never appear to advantage because it is the interest of the politically dominant people to discredit everything belonging to the subject race as inferior. The Author has been actuated by a strict regard for truth and a desire for the establishment of true Dharma. He has not spared from criticism what is mean, calculating, vulgar, inhuman in his own countrymen, nor has he minced words in condemning what is low or servile or selfish or imitative in Indians of to-day. Actuated by the highest aims, he has really given a most remarkable and convincing book on a difficult and much-abused theme." —*Bombay Chronicle.*

" Ably written defence of Hindu civilization by a profound scholar......It would have been better if he had entered as much an emphatic protest against the prevailing abuses of Hindu society as he has taken care to define its virtues and ideals."—*Everyman's Review.*

" It is rather unusual to find among the British members of the Indian Judiciary an apologist for the claims of the Neo-Hindu revivalists and their

allies the Extreme Nationalists. It is in this role that we find Sir John Woodroffe figuring as a sort of modern Saul among the prophets—much of the book is occupied with an unworthy attack on Western and particularly Christian civilization."—*Madras Mail.*

"From keen irritation and annoyance......we passed to a feeling of contempt touched by a sorry sense of amusement that the Absolute (or the Spirit or whatever else the Author wishes to call it) should indulge in the bad joke of this conflict...We consider both Mr. Archer and Sir John Woodroffe in this episode a nuisance...There is an absence of clearness even of logic...A person who presents such a position as this is not really and truly the friend of India."—*The Indian Philosophical Review (Professor A. Widgery).*

"Rechauffe' of more or less familiar arguments—without the illumination of any new thought—vague, obscure— illogical antithesis and loose and disingenuous assertions – Extravagant abstraction —cannot be exempted from the charge of bias. His interpretation of the West suggests that with all his metaphysical abstractions he is unable to distinguish form from reality— Vapourising, nebulous. The aspect of these essays is when not obscure, familiar ; their style is provocative without being very stimulating. The confusion of issues, the multiplication of sketchy extracts without context, the breach of simple rules of logic and a running speech

that gives no reason for the division into Chapters make altogether a book which is very hard to read and still harder to remember when read."

—*Englishman*.

"Sir John Woodroffe is a guide whom the reader may follow with confidence. He has lived many years in India and has shown himself to be in real sympathy with the spirit of the East; on the other hand he has not lost touch with the ideals of his own people, nor been blinded by the essential beauty of Indian tradition so as to be unaware of actual present defects; nor does he forget that those who write against or in praise of India must do so with exactness, discrimination, and the latter with the avoidance of mere puffing general statements. He is definite and balanced and gives one the impression of being thoroughly reliable."—*Theosophist (A de L)*.

"I admire the spirit of absolute fairness with which Sir John Woodroffe has approached the task —shoud be studied carefully by every Indian who aspires to lead the people and to mould the aspirations of his countrymen."—*Indian Review* (*Hon. Mr. Justice Seshagiri Aiyar*).

"The whole book is replete with useful suggestions to every one who is interested in a proper understanding of Indian culture—Sir John who has devoted many years to the study of Indian religion and who brings to his task a judicial frame of mind and abundant sympathy has no difficulty

in proving the utter hollowness of Mr. Archer's conclusions."—*Vedanta Keshari*.

"We have not seen any one who loves Bhârata as Sir John Woodroffe does. His pre-eminence consists in this that he has said that the service (Seva) of Bharata is the service of Shrî Bhagavan." *Utsava (R.D.M.)*

By the same Author

BHARATA SHAKTI

COLLECTION OF ADDRESSES ON INDIAN CULTURE.

"The thoughtful sayings of an honest foreigner a true Muni or "Freethinker" as he himself interprets the Hindu terms......ought to be in the hands of every Indian. It would give him thought and self respect. The Christian Missionary and the Christian Orientalist are the two great factors of Indian denationalisation. We fight the third factor the politician more or less successfully. We have fought the Missionary and defeated him generally but the scars of his early attacks we are unconsciously bearing as acceptable badges.........Thus when we run down—we are unwittingly showing ourselves as Chelas of the mediocrity of Europe. Like a living organism we must cast off the foreign matter trying to bore a home into our intellectual system. Sir John does not spare the Indian mind in its

analysis. He has very ably shown that our so often professed Vairagya is more often our incapacity and sometimes philosophic confusion. The little book is one of those productions which would go to make a new age in this country. It is a protest against cultural suicide of a civilization designed by its past to live for ever."—*Modern Review*.

"Sir John Woodroffe rarely says anything which has not an element of originality in it. He makes a powerful plea against the cultural conquest of this country by the nations of the West...a vigorous plea which we commend to the notice of every true born Indian. Sir John's sympathy is bold and fearless as his scholarship is deep and erudite—he has a clear and perspective view of our culture."—*Amrita Bazar Patrika*.

"The whole of the booklet is studded with shining gems of thought and thrilling insight into truth...this sterling faith in the profound individuality of India, in the glorious future which She is bound to work out for Herself in the great mission She is to fulfil in the world, animates every word spoken in the addresses compiled in this book. We cannot, in fact, overestimate the necessity of every student of India, of every worker in Her cause, furnishing himself with a copy of this compilation and it is our ardent wish that the great exponent of the wonderful Tantrik lore of India would more often make time to come forward, as in these addresses, to contribute his weighty ideas to the keen intellec-

tual struggle going on in our country round practical problems of re-organising our life and thought."
—*Prabuddha Bharata.*

"Inspiring title—he has what is not given to many, understood the soul of India. He is a thorough sympathiser with Indian aspirations and has dwelt upon the real aim and purpose of our efforts. Ought to be read by every patriotic Indian. He will then have a clear vision and feel a new strength in his onward struggle."—*New India.*

"Each of these papers is overflowing with thoughtfulness and desire to do good to Bharata. We ask every English educated man to read it. It will give us reverence for our natural culture and will save us from the thoughtless spirit of imitation."

"Politically India is dead, this is bad enough but if cultural conquest follows the political then She will be truly dead. Is India to be a mere name and Her culture assigned to the cold room of the Oriental scholar or is She to be a living form." Sir John Woodroffe takes up the question with as much enthusiasm as the youngest Nationalist amongst us. His answer is one of courage and hope,...but Sir John is not blind to the difficulties."—*Searchlight.*

WORKS BY ARTHUR AVALON ON TANTRA SHASTRA

	RS.	A.
Tantra of the Great Liberation. (*Mahânirvâna Tantra*). A Translation from the Sanskrit, with Introduction and Commentary by Arthur Avalon	8	0
Hymns to the Goddess. From the Tantra and other Shâstra and the Stotra of Shangkarâchâryya. With Introduction and Commentary. Translated from the Sanskrit by Arthur and Ellen Avalon ...	3	0
Principles of Tantra. Part I. The Tantratattva of Shrîyukta Shiva Chandra Vidyârnava Bhattâchâryya Mahodaya. Edited with an Introduction and Commentary by Arthur Avalon	8	0
Do do Part II. With an Introduction by Shrîyukta Barada Kânta Majumdar. Edited by Arthur Avalon ...	12	0
"**Wave of Bliss**" (*Anandalaharî*) a translation and Commentary by Arthur Avalon	1	8
"**Greatness of Shiva**" (*Mahimnastava of Pushpadânta*) a translation and commentary by Arthur Avalon together with Sanskrit commentary of Jagannâtha Chakravartti ...	1	8

BY SIR JOHN WOODROFFE

Shakti and Shakta. Essays and addresses on the Shakta Tantra Shastra	7	8
The Serpent Power. (*Kundalini Yoga*) ...	15	12
Garland of Letters. Reprinting.		

TANTRIK TEXTS

UNDER GENERAL EDITORSHIP OF

ARTHUR AVALON

	RS.	A.
Vol. I. Tantrabhidhana *with Bíja-Nighantu and Mudrâ-Nighantu.*—A Tantrik Dictionary, Edited by Târantha Vidyâratna with an Introduction in English by Arthur Avalon...	2	0
Vol. II. Shatchakranirupana.—A work on the six centres of the body by Pûrnânanda Svâmî, with Commentary of Shangkara. *Pâdukâpanchaka*—(" Five-fold foot-stool of the Guru "), wtih commentary of Kâlîcharana and Notes from the Tîkâ of Vishvanâtha on the Second Patala of Kaivalya Kâlikâ Tantra; with an Introduction in English by Arthur Avalon	2	0
Vol. III. Prapanchasara Tantra.—Edited by Târanâtha Vidyâratna, with an Introduction in English by Arthur Avalon ...	3	0
Vol. IV. Kulachudamani Nigama.—Edited by Girisha Chandra Vedântatîrtha. With an Introduction by Akshaya Kumâra Maitra	2	0
Vol. V. Kularnava Tantra.—Edited by Târanâtha Vidyâratna, with Introduction in English by Arthur Avalon. ...	3	0

RS. A.

Vol. VI. Kalivilasa Tantra.—Edited by Pârvati Charana Tarkatîrtha with English Introduction by Arthur Avalon ... 2 0

Vol. VII. Shrichakrasmabhara.—A Buddhist Tantra, edited by Kazi Dausamdup with a foreword on the Vajrayâna by Arthur Avalon ... ...

Vol. VIII. First Part. **Tantraraja** (*Kâdimata*) Edited by Mahâmahopâdhyâya Lakshmana Shâstri Drâvida 3 0

In the Press

Vol. IX. The Second Part of same is in preparation ... ...

Vol. X. Kamakalavilasa, a Tantrik Prakarana of the Kashmir School by Punyânanda with Commentary by Anantanâtha.

Vol. XI. Advaitabhavopanishad, Kalyupanishad, Taropanishad, Kaulopanishad, With Introduction by Arthur Avalon ...

To be had of

LUZAC & CO., LONDON. THACKER SPINK & CO.,

CALCUTTA. GANESH & CO., MADRAS.

TARAPOREWALA & SONS, BOMBAY.